arXiv:1604.04771v1 [math.DS] 16 Apr 2016

Finiteness theorems for commuting and semiconjugate rational functions

F. Pakovich

April 19, 2016

Abstract

In this paper we study the functional equation $A \circ X = X \circ B$, where A, B, and X are rational functions of degree at least two. More precisely, we assume that B is fixed and study solutions of the above equation in A and X. Roughly speaking, our main result states that, up to some natural transformations, the set of such solutions is finite, unless B is a Lattès function or is conjugated to $z^{\pm d}$ or $\pm T_d$. In more details, we show that there exist rational functions $A_1, A_2, \dots, A_r$ and $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_r$ such that the equality $A \circ X = X \circ B$ holds if and only if $A = \mu \circ A_j \circ \mu^{-1}$ for some j, $1 \leq j \leq r$, and Möbius transformation μ, and $X = \mu \circ X_j \circ B^{\circ k}$ for some $k \geq 1$. We also show that the degrees of X_j, $1 \leq j \leq r$, and r can be bounded from above by constants depending on degree of B only. As an application we obtain "effective" analogues of classical results about commuting rational functions.

1 Introduction

The problem of description of commuting rational functions, that is of rational solutions of the functional equation

$$B \circ A = A \circ B \tag{1}$$

was investigated already at the dawn of complex dynamics in the papers of Fatou, Julia, and Ritt [4], [5], [18]. The most general result was obtained by Ritt. It states roughly speaking that, unless A and B have an iteration in common, that is unless

$$A^{\circ l} = B^{\circ k} \tag{2}$$

for some $l, k \geq 1$, solutions of (1) reduce either to powers, or to Chebyshev polynomials, or to Lattès functions. Another proof of the Ritt theorem was given by Eremenko [2]. Notice that although the Ritt theorem solves the problem completely in the case where A and B do not have an iteration in common, it does not provide much information in the general case, since a characterization of A, B (commuting or not) satisfying (2) is known only in the polynomial case ([16], [18]).

Functional equation (1) can be considered as a particular case of the functional equation

$$A \circ X = X \circ B, \tag{3}$$

playing along with equation (1) an important role in complex dynamics (see e.g. the recent papers [3], [7]). In case if (3) is satisfied for some rational function X of degree at least two, the function B is called semiconjugate to the function A, and the function X is called a semiconjugacy from B to A. The case $\deg X = 1$ corresponds to the standard notion of conjugacy. From the point of view of complex dynamics (3) means that the dynamical system defined by A is a factor of the dynamical system defined by B. In distinction with the conjugacy the semiconjugacy is not an equivalency relation. For given rational functions A and B we will use the notation $A \leq B$ if there exists a non-constant rational function X such that (3) holds, and the notation $A \underset{X}{\leq} B$ if A,B, and X satisfy (3). It is clear that $A \underset{X}{\leq} B$ and $B \underset{Y}{\leq} C$ imply that $A \underset{X\circ Y}{\leq} C$, so the relation $\leq$ is a preorder on the set of rational functions.

Equation (3) was investigated in the recent paper [13]. The results of [13] imply that there exist two reasons for the relation $A \leq B$ to be hold. The first one is linked to an equivalence relation $\sim$ defined as follows. Let A be a rational function. For any decomposition $A = U \circ V$ of A into a composition of rational functions U and V, we can define a rational function $\widetilde{A} = V \circ U$, called an elementary transformation of A. By definition, $A \sim B$ if there exists a chain of elementary transformation

$$A = F_0 \to F_1 \to \cdots \to F_s = B$$

between A and B. Since for any elementary transformation $\widetilde{A}$ of A obviously $A \underset{U}{\leq} \widetilde{A}$ and $\widetilde{A} \underset{V}{\leq} A$, the relation $A \sim B$ implies that $A \leq B$ and $B \leq A$.

The second reason for $A \leq B$ to be hold can be described in terms of groups action on $\mathbb{CP}^1$ or $\mathbb{C}$. Namely, let Γ be a finite subgroup of the automorphism group of the Riemann sphere, that is a cyclic, dihedral, tetrahedral, octahedral, or icosahedral group, and θ_Γ the corresponding invariant rational function, that is a rational function such that $\theta_\Gamma(z_1) = \theta_\Gamma(z_2)$ if and only if $z_2 = \sigma(z_1)$ for some $\sigma \in \Gamma$. Let now $F : \mathbb{CP}^1 \to \mathbb{CP}^1$ be a rational function such that for any $\sigma \in \Gamma$ the equality

$$F \circ \sigma = \varphi(\sigma) \circ F \tag{4}$$

holds for some automorphism $\varphi : \Gamma \to \Gamma$, and Γ' be a subgroup of Γ such that

$$\varphi(\Gamma') \subseteq \Gamma'. \tag{5}$$

Then one can easily see that there exist rational functions $\mathcal{A}$, $\mathcal{B}$, and $\mathcal{X}$ such that $\theta_\Gamma = \mathcal{X} \circ \theta_{\Gamma'}$ and the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbb{CP}^1 & \xrightarrow{F} & \mathbb{CP}^1 \\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle \theta_{\Gamma'}} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \theta_{\Gamma'}} \\ \mathbb{CP}^1 & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{B}} & \mathbb{CP}^1 \\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle \chi} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \chi} \\ \mathbb{CP}^1 & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{A}} & \mathbb{CP}^1 \end{array} \tag{6}$$

is commutative. Thus, $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{X}$, and $\mathcal{B}$ satisfy (3). Similarly, if Γ is an automorphism group of the tilings of $\mathbb{C}$ by parallelograms, squares, equilateral triangles, or alternately equilateral triangles, and θ_Γ is the corresponding doubly periodical invariant function, then for any linear function $F : \mathbb{C} \to \mathbb{C}$, satisfying (4) for some monomorphism $\varphi : \Gamma \to \Gamma$, and a subgroup Γ' of Γ such that (5) holds, there exist rational functions $\mathcal{A}$, $\mathcal{B}$, and $\mathcal{X}$ such that diagram (6) is commutative and the corresponding $\mathcal{B}$ and $\mathcal{A}$ are semiconjugate.

The main result of [13] may be formulated as follows: if a rational function B is semiconjugate to a rational function A, then either $A \sim B$, or there exist $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ as above such that $A = \mathcal{A}$ and $B \sim \mathcal{B}$. Thus, "up to" the equivalence $\sim$ all solutions reduce to ones arising from diagram (6) and are related to group actions. Nevertheless, the results of [13] provide no information about the structure of the equivalence classes of $\sim$, and the present paper mostly addresses this issue. Notice that since for any rational function B of degree one the equality

$$A = (A \circ B) \circ B^{-1}$$

holds, each equivalence class of $\sim$ is a union of conjugacy classes. Thus, the equivalence relation $\sim$ can be considered as a weaker form of the classical conjugacy relation whose classes consist of functions having "similar" but not "identical" dynamics.

Notice that in the case where all involved functions are *polynomials* equation (3) was studied also in in the recent papers [7] and [15]. The approach of the paper [7] is based on the theory of decomposition of polynomials developed by Ritt [17], while the method of [15] relies on the results of [11] about polynomials sharing preimages of compact sets. However, methods of both these papers seem to be restricted to the polynomial case.

In this paper we study solutions of equation (3) for a fixed rational function B. In other words, for given B we study possible factors of a dynamical system associated with B and corresponding semiconjugacies. Notice that A is defined by X in a unique way, but for given A there could be several X satisfying (3). In particular, for any $k \geq 1$ we could change X to $\widetilde{X} = X \circ B^{\circ k}$. More generally, for any solution A, X of (3) we obtain another solution setting

$$\widetilde{A} = \mu \circ A \circ \mu^{-1}, \quad \widetilde{X} = \mu \circ X \circ B^{\circ k}, \tag{7}$$

where μ is an arbitrary Möbius transformation.

Say that a rational function B is special if either B is a Lattès function, or B is conjugated to $z^{\pm n}$ or to $\pm T_n$. In a simplified form the main result of this paper can be formulated as follows.

Theorem 1.1. *Let B be a non-special rational function of degree $d \geq 2$. Then there exist rational functions $A_1, A_2, \ldots, A_r$ and $X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_r$ such that A and X satisfy (3) if and only if*

$$A = \mu \circ A_j \circ \mu^{-1}, \quad X = \mu \circ X_j \circ B^{\circ k},$$

for some Möbius transformation μ, some j, $1 \leq j \leq r$, and some $k \geq 0$. Furthermore, there exist (computable) functions ψ and φ on $\mathbb{N}$ such that $r \leq \psi(d)$ and $\deg X_j \leq \varphi(d)$, $1 \leq j \leq r$, for any non-special B of degree d.

Notice that Theorem 1.1 bounds both the number of conjugacy classes of rational functions A such that $A \leq B$, and, up to the second transformation in (7), the number of rational functions X such that (3) holds for a fixed rational function A. In particular, Theorem 1.1 implies that for any non-special B the equivalence class containing B is a union of at most a finite number of conjugacy classes.

For equation (1) considered as a particular case of equation (3) we prove the following result.

Theorem 1.2. *Let B be a non-special rational function of degree $d \geq 2$. Then there exist rational functions $X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_s$ commuting with B such that a rational function X commutes with B if and only if*

$$X = X_j \circ B^{\circ k}$$

for some j, $1 \leq j \leq s$, and $k \geq 0$. Furthermore, there exist (computable) functions δ and φ on $\mathbb{N}$ such that $s \leq \delta(d)$ and $\deg X_j \leq \varphi(d)$, $1 \leq j \leq s$, for any non-special B of degree d.

Notice that Theorem 1.2 implies immediately the result of Ritt about commuting rational functions in its part concerning non-special functions. Indeed, if X commutes with B, then any iteration of $X^{\circ l}$ does. Therefore, it follows from Theorem 1.2 by the Dirichlet box principle that whenever B is non-special there exist distinct l_1, $l_2 \leq \delta(d) + 1$ such that

$$X^{\circ l_1} = X_j \circ B^{\circ k_1}, \qquad X^{\circ l_2} = X_j \circ B^{\circ k_2}$$

for the same j and some k_1, k_2. Therefore, assuming that $l_2 > l_1$, we have:

$$X^{\circ l_2} = X^{\circ l_1} \circ B^{\circ k_2 - k_1}, \tag{8}$$

implying that

$$X^{\circ (l_2 - 1_1)} = B^{\circ (k_2 - k_1)},$$

since X and B commute.

In more details, using our techniques, we prove the following "effective" version of the classical Ritt result.

Theorem 1.3. *There exists a (computable) function κ on $\mathbb{N}\times\mathbb{N}$ such that for any commuting rational functions B and X of degrees $d\geq 2$ and $e\geq 2$ correspondingly, one of the following conditions holds:*

- *B is conjugated to $z^{\pm d}$, and X is conjugated to $z^{\pm e}$,*
- *B is conjugated to $\pm T_d$, and X is conjugated to $\pm T_e$,*
- *B is a Lattès function, and X is a Lattès function,*
- *$X^{\circ l}=B^{\circ k}$, where $l+k\leq\kappa(d,e)$.*

In the rest of this introduction we briefly describe the methods and the structure of the paper.

As in the paper [13], our approach is based on the theory of two dimensional orbifolds. Recall, that an orbifold $\mathcal{O}$ on the Riemann sphere is $\mathbb{CP}^1$ provided with a ramification function $\nu:\mathbb{CP}^1\to\mathbb{N}$ which takes the value $\nu(z)=1$ except a finite set of points. The Euler characteristic of an orbifold $\mathcal{O}$ is defined by the formula

$$\chi(\mathcal{O})=2+\sum_{z\in\mathbb{CP}^1}\left(\frac{1}{\nu(z)}-1\right). \tag{9}$$

A rational function f is said to be a covering map $f:\ \mathcal{O}_1\to\mathcal{O}_2$ between orbifolds $\mathcal{O}_1$ and $\mathcal{O}_2$ with ramification functions ν_1 and ν_2 if for any $z\in\mathbb{CP}^1$ the equality

$$\nu_2(f(z))=\nu_1(z)\deg{}_z f \tag{10}$$

holds, where $\deg{}_z f$ is the local degree of f at the point z. With each rational function f one can associate in a natural way two orbifolds $\mathcal{O}_1^f$ and $\mathcal{O}_2^f$, setting $\nu_2^f(z)$ equal to the least common multiple of local degrees of f at the points of the preimage $f^{-1}\{z\}$, and

$$\nu_1^f(z)=\nu_2^f(f(z))/\deg{}_z f.$$

By construction, $f:\ \mathcal{O}_1^f\to\mathcal{O}_2^f$ is a covering map between orbifolds.

If for any $z\in\mathbb{CP}^1$ instead of equality (10) a weaker condition

$$\nu_2(f(z))\mid\nu_1(z)\deg{}_z f \tag{11}$$

holds, then f is said to be a holomorphic map $f:\ \mathcal{O}_1\to\mathcal{O}_2$ between orbifolds $\mathcal{O}_1$ and $\mathcal{O}_2$. For fixed $\nu_2(z)$ the minimal possible value for $\nu_1(z)$ such that (11) holds is defined by the equality

$$\nu_2(f(z))=\nu_1(z)\mathrm{GCD}(\deg{}_z f,\nu_2(f(z)). \tag{12}$$

In case if (12) is satisfied for any $z\in\mathbb{CP}^1$ we say that $f:\ \mathcal{O}_1\to\mathcal{O}_2$ is a minimal holomorphic map between orbifolds.

It was shown in the papers [13], [14] that rational functions f with $\chi(\mathcal{O}_2^f)\geq 0$ along with rational functions $f:\ \mathcal{O}_1\to\mathcal{O}_2$ which are minimal holomorphic maps

between orbifolds of non-negative characteristic play a very special role in the description of solution of equation (3) or, more generally, in the description of solutions of the equation

$$A \circ C = D \circ B, \tag{13}$$

where A, B, C, D are rational functions. For example, the main result of [13] can be formulated as follows: if A, X, B is a solution of (3), then either $A \sim B$, or there exist orbifolds $\mathcal{O}_1$, $\mathcal{O}_2$ of non-negative Euler characteristic on the Riemann sphere such that the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{O}_1 & \xrightarrow{B} & \mathcal{O}_1 \\ \big\downarrow X & & \big\downarrow X \\ \mathcal{O}_2 & \xrightarrow{A} & \mathcal{O}_2 \end{array}$$

consists of minimal holomorphic maps between orbifolds. On the other hand, it was shown in [14] that if A, B, C, D satisfy (13) and the algebraic curve

$$A(x) - D(y) = 0$$

is irreducible, then whenever

$$\deg D \geq 84 \deg A,$$

the inequality $\chi(\mathcal{O}_2^A) \geq 0$ holds. Notice that rational functions A for which $\chi(\mathcal{O}_2^A) \geq 0$ can be characterized in terms of Galois theory as the rational functions such that the Galois closure of $\mathbb{C}(z)/\mathbb{C}(A)$ has genus zero or one.

The paper is organized as follows. In the second section we fix the notation and recall some results from [13] relating functional equation (13) with two-dimensional orbifolds. In Section 3-5 we study minimal holomorphic maps and minimal holomorphic self-maps between orbifolds of non-negative characteristic. Notice that the studied class is a natural generalization of the class of f Lattès functions which may be characterized as covering self-maps between orbifolds of zero Euler characteristic.

The Sections 6-8 contain results about chains of elementary transformations. We start from a description of solutions of (13) satisfying some additional assumptions. Then we introduce different types of chains, study the relations between them, and prove the main technical result - upper bounds for the length of any "good" chain between non-special functions of fixed degree.

In Sections 9-10 we prove the main results of the paper. In particular, we show (Theorem 10.1) that if B is a non-special rational function, then any rational function X such that (3) holds for some rational function A can be decomposed in a canonical way into a composition $X = \widetilde{X} \circ U \circ B^{\circ k}$, where $\chi(\mathcal{O}_2^{\widetilde{X}}) > 0$, the function U is a compositional right factor of $B^{\circ l}$, and $k \geq 1$. Moreover, we show that $\deg \widetilde{X}$ and l can be bounded from above in terms of degree of B only. Finally, basing on this last result we prove theorems mentioned above.

2 Functional decompositions and orbifolds

2.1 Functions and orbifolds

In this section we fix the notation and recall main definitions and results related to orbifolds whose underlying space is a Riemann surface (see [9], Appendix E). We also collect some technical results, mostly from the papers [12], [13], used in the following.

A pair $\mathcal{O} = (R, \nu)$ consisting of a Riemann surface R and a ramification function $\nu : R \to \mathbb{N}$ which takes the value $\nu(z) = 1$ except at isolated points is called an orbifold. The Euler characteristic of an orbifold $\mathcal{O} = (R, \nu)$ is defined by the formula

$$\chi(\mathcal{O}) = \chi(R) + \sum_{z \in R} \left(\frac{1}{\nu(z)} - 1 \right), \tag{14}$$

where $\chi(R)$ is the Euler characteristic of R. For an orbifold $\mathcal{O} = (R, \nu)$ set

$$c(\mathcal{O}) = \{z_1, z_2, \dots, z_s, \dots\} = \{z \in R \mid \nu(z) > 1\},$$

and

$$\nu(\mathcal{O}) = \{\nu(z_1), \nu(z_2), \dots, \nu(z_s), \dots\}.$$

If R_1, R_2 are Riemann surfaces provided with ramification functions ν_1, ν_2 and $f : R_1 \to R_2$ is a holomorphic branched covering map, then f is called *a covering map* $f : \mathcal{O}_1 \to \mathcal{O}_2$ *between orbifolds* $\mathcal{O}_1 = (R_1, \nu_1)$ *and* $\mathcal{O}_2 = (R_2, \nu_2)$ if for any $z \in R_1$ the equality

$$\nu_2(f(z)) = \nu_1(z) \deg_z f \tag{15}$$

holds, where $\deg_z f$ is the local degree of f at the point z. If for any $z \in R_1$ instead of equality (15) a weaker condition

$$\nu_2(f(z)) \mid \nu_1(z) \deg_z f \tag{16}$$

holds, then f is called *a holomorphic map* $f : \mathcal{O}_1 \to \mathcal{O}_2$ *between orbifolds* $\mathcal{O}_1$ *and* $\mathcal{O}_2$.

A universal covering of an orbifold $\mathcal{O}$ is a covering map between orbifolds $\theta_{\mathcal{O}} : \widetilde{\mathcal{O}} \to \mathcal{O}$ such that $\widetilde{R}$ is simply connected and $\widetilde{\nu}(z) \equiv 1$. If $\theta_{\mathcal{O}}$ is such a map, then there exists a group $\Gamma_{\mathcal{O}}$ of conformal automorphisms of $\widetilde{R}$ such that the equality $\theta_{\mathcal{O}}(z_1) = \theta_{\mathcal{O}}(z_2)$ holds for $z_1, z_2 \in \widetilde{R}$ if and only if $z_1 = \sigma(z_2)$ for some $\sigma \in \Gamma_{\mathcal{O}}$. A universal covering exists and is unique up to a conformal isomorphism of $\widetilde{R}$, unless $\mathcal{O}$ is the Riemann sphere with one ramified point, or the Riemann sphere with two ramified points z_1, z_2 such that $\nu(z_1) \neq \nu(z_2)$. Abusing notation we will use the symbol $\widetilde{\mathcal{O}}$ both for the orbifold and for the Riemann surface $\widetilde{R}$.

Covering maps between orbifolds lift to isomorphisms between their universal coverings. More generally, the following proposition holds (see [13], Proposition 3.1).

Proposition 2.1. *Let $f : \mathcal{O}_1 \to \mathcal{O}_2$ be a holomorphic map between orbifolds. Then for any choice of $\theta_{\mathcal{O}_1}$ and $\theta_{\mathcal{O}_2}$ there exist a holomorphic map $F : \widetilde{\mathcal{O}_1} \to \widetilde{\mathcal{O}_2}$ and a homomorphism $\varphi : \Gamma_{\mathcal{O}_1} \to \Gamma_{\mathcal{O}_2}$ such that diagram*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \widetilde{\mathcal{O}_1} & \xrightarrow{F} & \widetilde{\mathcal{O}_2} \\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle \theta_{\mathcal{O}_1}} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \theta_{\mathcal{O}_2}} \\ \mathcal{O}_1 & \xrightarrow{f} & \mathcal{O}_2 \end{array} \tag{17}$$

is commutative and for any $\sigma \in \Gamma_{\mathcal{O}_1}$ the equality

$$F \circ \sigma = \varphi(\sigma) \circ F \tag{18}$$

holds. The map F is defined by $\theta_{\mathcal{O}_1}$, $\theta_{\mathcal{O}_2}$, and f uniquely up to a transformation $F \to g \circ F$, where $g \in \Gamma_{\mathcal{O}_2}$. In other direction, for any holomorphic map $F : \widetilde{\mathcal{O}_1} \to \widetilde{\mathcal{O}_2}$ which satisfies (18) *for some homomorphism $\varphi : \Gamma_{\mathcal{O}_1} \to \Gamma_{\mathcal{O}_2}$ there exists a uniquely defined holomorphic map between orbifolds $f : \mathcal{O}_1 \to \mathcal{O}_2$ such that diagram* (17) *is commutative. The holomorphic map F is an isomorphism if and only if f is a covering map between orbifolds.* □

If $f : \mathcal{O}_1 \to \mathcal{O}_2$ is a covering map between orbifolds with compact supports, then the Riemann-Hurwitz formula implies that

$$\chi(\mathcal{O}_1) = d\chi(\mathcal{O}_2), \tag{19}$$

where $d = \deg f$. For holomorphic maps the following statement is true (see [13], Proposition 3.2).

Proposition 2.2. *Let $f : \mathcal{O}_1 \to \mathcal{O}_2$ be a holomorphic map between orbifolds with compact supports. Then*

$$\chi(\mathcal{O}_1) \leq \chi(\mathcal{O}_2) \deg f, \tag{20}$$

and the equality holds if and only if $f : \mathcal{O}_1 \to \mathcal{O}_2$ is a covering map between orbifolds. □

Let R_1, R_2 be Riemann surfaces, and $f : R_1 \to R_2$ a holomorphic branched covering map. Assume that R_2 is provided with ramification function ν_2. In order to define a ramification function ν_1 on R_1 so that f would be a holomorphic map between orbifolds $\mathcal{O}_1 = (R_1, \nu_1)$ and $\mathcal{O}_2 = (R_2, \nu_2)$ we must satisfy condition (16), and it is easy to see that for any $z \in R_1$ a minimal possible value for $\nu_1(z)$ is defined by the equality

$$\nu_2(f(z)) = \nu_1(z)\mathrm{GCD}(\deg_z f, \nu_2(f(z)). \tag{21}$$

In case if (21) is satisfied for any $z \in R_1$ we say that f is *a minimal holomorphic map between orbifolds $\mathcal{O}_1 = (R_1, \nu_1)$ and $\mathcal{O}_2 = (R_2, \nu_2)$.*

It follows from the definition that for any orbifold $\mathcal{O} = (R, \nu)$ and holomorphic branched covering map $f : R' \to R$ there exists a unique orbifold structure ν' on R' such that f becomes a minimal holomorphic map between orbifolds. We will denote the corresponding orbifold by $f^*\mathcal{O}$. Notice that any covering map between orbifolds $f : \mathcal{O}_1 \to \mathcal{O}_2$ is a minimal holomorphic map. In particular, $\mathcal{O}_1 = f^*\mathcal{O}_2$. For orbifolds $\mathcal{O}_1$ and $\mathcal{O}_2$ write

$$\nu(\mathcal{O}_1) \leq \nu(\mathcal{O}_2) \tag{22}$$

if for any $x \in c(\mathcal{O}_1)$ there exists $y \in c(\mathcal{O}_2)$ such that $\nu(x) \mid \nu(y)$. Clearly, the condition that $f : \mathcal{O}_1 \to \mathcal{O}_2$ is a minimal holomorphic map between orbifolds implies condition (22).

Minimal holomorphic maps between orbifolds possess the following fundamental property with respect to compositions (see [13], Theorem 4.1).

Theorem 2.3. *Let $f : R'' \to R'$ and $g : R' \to R$ be holomorphic branched covering maps, and $\mathcal{O} = (R, \nu)$ an orbifold. Then*

$$(g \circ f)^*\mathcal{O} = f^*(g^*\mathcal{O}). \qquad \square$$

Theorem 2.3 implies in particular the following corollaries (see [13], Corollary 4.1 and Corollary 4.2).

Corollary 2.4. *Let $f : \mathcal{O}_1 \to \mathcal{O}'$ and $g : \mathcal{O}' \to \mathcal{O}_2$ be minimal holomorphic maps (resp. covering maps) between orbifolds. Then $g \circ f : \mathcal{O}_1 \to \mathcal{O}_2$ is a minimal holomorphic map (resp. covering map).* □

Corollary 2.5. *Let $f : R_1 \to R'$ and $g : R' \to R_2$ be holomorphic branched covering maps, and $\mathcal{O}_1 = (R_1, \nu_1)$ and $\mathcal{O}_2 = (R_2, \nu_2)$ orbifolds. Assume that $g \circ f : \mathcal{O}_1 \to \mathcal{O}_2$ is a minimal holomorphic map (resp. a covering map). Then $g : g^*\mathcal{O}_2 \to \mathcal{O}_2$ and $f : \mathcal{O}_1 \to g^*\mathcal{O}_2$ are minimal holomorphic maps (resp. covering maps).* □

With each holomorphic function $f : R_1 \to R_2$ between compact Riemann surfaces one can associate in a natural way two orbifolds $\mathcal{O}_1^f = (R_1, \nu_1^f)$ and $\mathcal{O}_2^f = (R_2, \nu_2^f)$, setting $\nu_2^f(z)$ equal to the least common multiple of local degrees of f at the points of the preimage $f^{-1}\{z\}$, and

$$\nu_1^f(z) = \nu_2^f(f(z))/\deg{}_z f.$$

By construction, $f : \mathcal{O}_1^f \to \mathcal{O}_2^f$ is a covering map between orbifolds. Furthermore, since the composition $f \circ \theta_{\mathcal{O}_1^f} : \widetilde{\mathcal{O}_1^f} \to \mathcal{O}_2^f$ is a covering map between orbifolds by Corollary 2.4, it follows from the uniqueness of the universal covering that

$$\theta_{\mathcal{O}_2^f} = f \circ \theta_{\mathcal{O}_1^f}. \tag{23}$$

For orbifolds $\mathcal{O}$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{O}}$ write

$$\mathcal{O} \preceq \widetilde{\mathcal{O}} \tag{24}$$

if for any $z \in \mathbb{CP}^1$ the condition $\nu(z) \mid \widetilde{\nu}(z)$ holds. It is easy to see that the covering map $f : \mathcal{O}_1^f \to \mathcal{O}_2^f$ is minimal in the following sense. For any covering map between orbifolds $f : \mathcal{O}_1 \to \mathcal{O}_2$ we have:

$$\mathcal{O}_1^f \preceq \mathcal{O}_1, \quad \mathcal{O}_2^f \preceq \mathcal{O}_2. \tag{25}$$

On the other hand, for any holomorphic map $f : \mathcal{O}_1 \to \mathcal{O}_2$ we have:

$$f^*\mathcal{O}_2 \preceq \mathcal{O}_1.$$

Clearly, (24) implies that $\nu(\mathcal{O}) \leq \nu(\widetilde{\mathcal{O}})$ but the inverse is not true.

In this paper essentially all considered orbifolds will be defined on $\mathbb{CP}^1$. The only exceptions from this rules are orbifolds which are universal coverings. So, usually we will omit the Riemann surface R in the definition of $\mathcal{O} = (R, \nu)$ meaning that $R = \mathbb{CP}^1$. For such an orbifold we will denote by $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{O})$ the subgroup of $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{CP}^1)$ consisting of Möbius transformations μ which respect the ramification of $\mathcal{O}$, that is such that $\mu : \mathcal{O} \to \mathcal{O}$ is a covering map between orbifolds.

2.2 Fiber products and orbifolds

Let $h : \mathbb{CP}^1 \to \mathbb{CP}^1$ be a rational function, and $c(h) = \{z_1, z_2, \ldots, z_r\}$ the set of critical values of h. Fix a point $z_0 \in \mathbb{CP}^1 \setminus c(h)$ and some loops γ_i around z_i, $1 \leq i \leq r$, such that $\gamma_1\gamma_2 ... \gamma_r = 1$ in $\pi_1(\mathbb{CP}^1 \setminus c(h), z_0)$. Denote by δ_i, $1 \leq i \leq r$, a permutation of points of $h^{-1}\{z_0\}$ induced by the lifting of γ_i, $1 \leq i \leq r$, by h. The permutation group G_h generated by δ_i, $1 \leq i \leq r$, is called the monodromy group of h. Clearly, for each i, $1 \leq i \leq r$, the collection $(l_{i1}, l_{i2}, \ldots, l_{is_i})$ of lengths of disjoint cycles in the permutation δ_i is a partition of the number $n = \deg h$ and coincides with the collection of local degrees of h at the points of the set $h^{-1}\{z_i\}$. We will use the notation

$$R(h) = \Big(\{l_{11}, l_{12}, \ldots l_{1s_1}\}_{z_1}, \ldots, \{l_{r1}, l_{r2}, \ldots, l_{rs_r}\}_{z_r}\Big)$$

to denote the fact that the rational function h has r critical values z_1, z_2, ... z_r, and the collection of local degrees of h at the points of the set $h^{-1}\{z_i\}$, $1 \leq i \leq r$, is $\{l_{i1}, l_{i2}, \ldots, l_{is_i}\}$.

The group G_h is closely related to compositional properties of the function h. Namely, if h can be decomposed into a composition $h = f \circ p$ of rational functions p and f, where $\deg f = d$, then G_h has an imprimitivity system consisting of d blocks $\mathcal{A}_i = p^{-1}\{t_i\}$, $1 \leq i \leq d$, where $\{t_1, t_2, \ldots, t_d\} = f^{-1}\{z_0\}$, and the permutation group induced by the action of G_h on these blocks is permutation isomorphic to the group G_f. Furthermore, any imprimitivity system of G_h arises from a decomposition of h, and decompositions $h = f \circ p$ and $h = g \circ q$ lead to the same imprimitivity system if and only there exists a Möbius transformation μ such that

$$f = g \circ \mu^{-1}, \quad p = \mu \circ q.$$

Such decompositions are called *equivalent*.

We will say that two rational functions functions p and q have no non-trivial compositional common right factor, if the equalities

$$p = \widetilde{p} \circ w, \quad q = \widetilde{q} \circ w,$$

where $\widetilde{p}$, $\widetilde{q}$ and w are rational functions, imply that w is a Möbius transformation. By the Lüroth theorem this is equivalent to the requirement that $\mathbb{C}(p, q) = \mathbb{C}(z)$.

Let A, B, C, D be a solution of (13), and $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{D}$ imprimitivity systems of the group G_F corresponding to the decompositions $F = A \circ C$ and $F = D \circ B$ respectively. We say that the solution A, B, C, D is *good* if any block of $\mathcal{A}$ intersects with any block of $\mathcal{D}$ and this intersection consists of a unique element. This is equivalent to the requirement that the fiber product of the coverings $A : \mathbb{CP}^1 \to \mathbb{CP}^1$ and $D : \mathbb{CP}^1 \to \mathbb{CP}^1$ has a unique component, and B and C have no non-trivial common compositional right factor. Notice that if A, B, C, D is a good solution of (13), then $\deg A = \deg B$ and $\deg C = \deg D$. Furthermore, the following statement holds (see [13], Lemma 2.1).

Lemma 2.6. *A solution A, B, C, D of (13) is good whenever any two of the following three conditions are satisfied:*

- *the fiber product of A and D has a unique component,*
- *B and C have no non-trivial common compositional right factor,*
- $\deg A = \deg B, \quad \deg C = \deg D.$ □

Notice that irreducible components of the fiber product of A and D correspond to irreducible components of the algebraic curve

$$\mathcal{E}_{A,D} : A(x) - D(y) = 0.$$

In particular, the fiber product of A and D has a unique component if and only if $\mathcal{E}(A, D)$ is irreducible (see [12], Proposition 2.4). On the other hand, we have the following result (see [13], Corollary 2.1).

Lemma 2.7. *Let A, C, D, B be a solution of (13). Then C and B have no non-trivial common compositional right factor if and only if for any $z \in \mathbb{CP}^1$ the local degrees $\deg_z C$ and $\deg_z B$ are coprime.* □

Good solutions of (13) possess "good" properties with respect to the orbifolds associated with its components. Namely, the following statement holds (see [13], Theorem 4.2).

Theorem 2.8. *If A, B, C, D is good solution of (13), then the commutative diagram*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{O}_1^C & \xrightarrow{B} & \mathcal{O}_1^D \\ \big\downarrow{\scriptstyle C} & & \big\downarrow{\scriptstyle D} \\ \mathcal{O}_2^C & \xrightarrow{A} & \mathcal{O}_2^D \end{array} \tag{26}$$

consists of minimal holomorphic maps between orbifolds. □

Of coarse, vertical arrows in the above diagram are covering maps and therefore are minimal holomorphic maps simply by definition. The meaning of the theorem is that the branching of D and C to a certain extent defines the branching of A and B. For example, if

$$C = D = X,$$

that if we deal with equation (3), then the fact that $A : \mathcal{O}_2^X \to \mathcal{O}_2^X$ is a minimal holomorphic map between orbifold implies by (20) that $\chi(\mathcal{O}_2^X) \geq 0$. Since this condition is very restrictive (see the next subsection) it permits to obtain quite a neat description of good solutions of (3) (see [13]).

Another corollary of Theorem 2.8 is the following fact: if A, B, C, D is a good solution of (13) such that the numbers $\deg A = n$ and $\deg C = m$ satisfy the inequality $m \geq 84\, n$, then $\chi(\mathcal{O}_2^A) \geq 0$ (see Theorem 3.1 of [14]). The last result follows from Theorem 2.8 and Proposition 2.2 combined with an estimation for $\mathcal{O}_2^C$ for a rational function C. A similar idea is used also in the present paper (see Proposition 8.1 below).

2.3 Functions A with $\chi(\mathcal{O}_2^A) \geq 0$

If $\mathcal{O} = (\mathbb{CP}^1, \nu)$ is an orbifold such that $\chi(\mathcal{O}) = 0$, then (14) implies that the collection of its ramification indices $\nu(\mathcal{O})$ is either $\{2,2,2,2\}$, or one of the following triples $\{3,3,3\}$, $\{2,4,4\}$, $\{2,3,6\}$. For all such orbifolds $\widetilde{\mathcal{O}} = \mathbb{C}$. Furthermore, the group $\Gamma_{\mathcal{O}}$ is generated by translations of $\mathbb{C}$ by elements of some lattice $L \subset \mathbb{C}$ of rank two and the transformation $z \to \varepsilon z$, where ε is nth root of unity with n equal to 2,3,4, or 6, such that $\varepsilon L = L$. If $\nu(\mathcal{O})$ is $\{2,2,2,2\}$, then the complex structure of $\mathbb{C}/L$ may be arbitrary, while if $\nu(\mathcal{O})$ is $\{2,4,4\}$, $\{2,3,6\}$, $\{3,3,3\}$ this structure is rigid and arises from the tiling of $\mathbb{C}$ by squares, equilateral triangles, or alternately colored equilateral triangles, respectively. Accordingly, the functions $\theta_{\mathcal{O}}$ are Galois covering of $\mathbb{CP}^1$ by $\mathbb{C}$ and may be written in terms of the corresponding Weierstrass functions as $\wp(z)$, $\wp^2(z)$, $\wp'(z)$, and $\wp'^2(z)$. Notice finally that if $\chi(\mathcal{O}) < 0$, then in fact

$$\chi(\mathcal{O}) \leq -\frac{1}{42}, \tag{27}$$

where the equality attains for the collection of ramification indices $(2,3,7)$.

If $\chi(\mathcal{O}) > 0$, then $\nu(\mathcal{O})$ is either $\{n,n\}$ for some $n \geq 2$, or $\{2,2,n\}$ for some $n \geq 2$, or one of the following triples $\{2,3,3\}$, $\{2,3,4\}$, $\{2,3,5\}$. In fact, formula (14) also allows $\mathcal{O}$ to be a non-ramified sphere or one of two orbifolds without universal covering. However, for any rational function A both orbifolds $\mathcal{O}_1^A$, $\mathcal{O}_2^A$ have a universal covering (see [13], Lemma 4.2), and $\mathcal{O}_2^A$ cannot be non-ramified. Thus, if $\mathcal{O} = \mathcal{O}_2^A$ for some rational function A, then the collection of ramification indices of $\mathcal{O}$ belongs to the above list. For such collections, $\widetilde{\mathcal{O}} = \mathbb{CP}^1$, and the group $\Gamma_{\mathcal{O}}$ is a finite subgroup of the automorphism group of $\mathbb{CP}^1$. Namely, to orbifolds with the collections of ramification indices $\{n,n\}$, $\{2,2,n\}$, $\{2,3,3\}$, $\{2,3,4\}$, and $\{2,3,5\}$ correspond the groups C_n, D_{2n}, A_4, S_4, and A_5. The

corresponding functions $\theta_{\mathcal{O}}$ are Galois covering of $\mathbb{CP}^1$ by $\mathbb{CP}^1$ and have degrees n, $2n$, 12, 24, and 60. They were were calculated for the first time by F. Klein in his book [6].

Rational functions A for which $\chi(\mathcal{O}_2^A) \geq 0$ can be characterized in terms of Galois theory as the rational functions such that the Galois closure of $\mathbb{C}(z)/\mathbb{C}(A)$ has genus zero or one. More precisely, the following statement holds (see [14], Lemma 2.1).

Lemma 2.9. *Let A be a rational function. Then $\chi(\mathcal{O}_2^A) > 0$ if and only if there exists a Galois covering $f : \mathbb{CP}^1 \to \mathbb{CP}^1$ such that $\mathcal{O}_2^f = \mathcal{O}_2^A$ and $f = A \circ p$ for some $p : \mathbb{CP}^1 \to \mathbb{CP}^1$. Similarly, $\chi(\mathcal{O}_2^A) = 0$ if and only if there exist a complex torus $\mathbb{T}$ and a Galois covering $f : \mathbb{T} \to \mathbb{CP}^1$ such that $\mathcal{O}_2^f = \mathcal{O}_2^A$ and $f = A \circ p$ for some $p : \mathbb{T} \to \mathbb{CP}^1$.* □

Since Galois coverings of $\mathbb{CP}^1$ by $\mathbb{CP}^1$ themselves are rational functions, all their rational "left factors" can be listed. Thus, Lemma 2.9 gives a practical way of description of rational functions A with $\chi(\mathcal{O}_2^A) > 0$. Below, we illustrate this statement providing a complete description of A for which $\nu(\mathcal{O}_2^A)$ is $\{n, n\}$, $n \geq 2$, $\{2, 2, n\}$, $n \geq 2$, or $\{2, 3, 3\}$.

Let us introduce the following equivalency relation:

$$A_1 \underset{\mu}{\sim} A_2$$

if rational functions A_1 and A_2 satisfy the equality

$$A_1 = \mu_1 \circ A_2 \circ \mu_2,$$

for some Möbius transformations μ_1 and μ_2. In order to distinguish the relation $\underset{\mu}{\sim}$ with the relation $\sim$ introduced above, we will call the corresponding functions μ-equivalent.

$\nu(\mathcal{O}_2^A) = \{n, n\}$. In this case, assuming that $\mathcal{O} = \mathcal{O}_2^A$ is given by

$$\nu(0) = n, \qquad \nu(\infty) = n,$$

we have:

$$\theta_{\mathcal{O}} = z^n \circ \mu,$$

where μ is a Möbius transformation. Further, any decomposition of z^n into a composition of two rational functions has the form

$$(z^{n/d} \circ \mu) \circ (\mu^{-1} \circ z^d), \tag{28}$$

where $d|n$ and μ is a Möbius transformation. Since

$$\mathcal{O}_2^{z^{n/d}} = \{n/d, n/d\},$$

and $\{n/d, n/d\} \neq \{n, n\}$ for $d > 1$, we conclude that the equality $\nu(\mathcal{O}_2^A) = \{n, n\}$ holds if and only $A \underset{\mu}{\sim} z^n$.

$\nu(\mathcal{O}_2^A) = \{2, 2, n\}$. In this case, assuming that $\mathcal{O} = \mathcal{O}_2^A$ is given by

$$\nu(-1) = 2, \quad \nu(1) = 2, \quad \nu(\infty) = n,$$

we have:

$$\theta_{\mathcal{O}} = \frac{1}{2}\left(z^n + \frac{1}{z^n}\right) \circ \mu,$$

where μ is a Möbius transformation. Furthermore, any decomposition of $\frac{1}{2}\left(z^n + z^{-n}\right)$ either has the form

$$\frac{1}{2}\left(z^n + \frac{1}{z^n}\right) = \left(\frac{1}{2}\left(z^{n/d} + \frac{1}{z^{n/d}}\right) \circ \mu\right) \circ \left(\mu^{-1} \circ z^d\right), \tag{29}$$

where $d|n$ and μ is a Möbius transformation, or the form

$$\frac{1}{2}\left(z^n + \frac{1}{z^n}\right) = \left(\varepsilon^{n/d} T_{n/d} \circ \mu\right) \circ \left(\mu^{-1} \circ \frac{1}{2}\left(\varepsilon z^d + \frac{1}{\varepsilon z^d}\right)\right), \tag{30}$$

where $d|n$, $\varepsilon^{2n/d} = 1$, and μ is a Möbius transformation (see e. g. Appendix of [10]). Therefore, if $\nu(\mathcal{O}_2^A) = \{2, 2, n\}$, then either

$$A = \frac{1}{2}\left(z^n + \frac{1}{z^n}\right) \circ \mu,$$

where μ is a Möbius transformation, or

$$A = \pm T_n \circ \mu,$$

where μ is a Möbius transformation (for odd n the sign $\pm$ is not necessary since $T_n(-z) = (-1)^n T_n(z)$). Notice that any decomposition of T_n into a composition of two rational functions has the form

$$(T_{n/d} \circ \mu) \circ (\mu^{-1} \circ T_d), \tag{31}$$

where $d|n$ and μ is a Möbius transformation.

Since the groups A_4, S_4 and A_5 are finite, the above calculation implies that up to the change $A \to \mu_1 \circ A \circ \mu_2$, where μ_1 and μ_2 are Möbius transformations, besides the functions

$$z^n, \qquad T_n, \qquad \frac{1}{2}\left(z^n + \frac{1}{z^n}\right), \quad n \geq 2, \tag{32}$$

the class of functions A with $\chi(\mathcal{O}_2^A) > 0$ contains only a finite number of functions. Notice that

$$z^2 \underset{\mu}{\sim} T_2 \underset{\mu}{\sim} \frac{1}{2}\left(z + \frac{1}{z}\right).$$

However, it is easy to see that if $n > 2$, then $z^n \underset{\mu}{\not\sim} T_n$, and

$$\frac{1}{2}\left(z^n + \frac{1}{z^n}\right) \underset{\mu}{\not\sim} T_{2n}, \qquad \frac{1}{2}\left(z^n + \frac{1}{z^n}\right) \underset{\mu}{\not\sim} z^{2n}, \quad n \geq 2.$$

$\nu(\mathcal{O}_2^A) = \{2,3,3\}$. Since $A : \mathcal{O}_1^A \to \mathcal{O}_2^A$ is a covering map, it follows from (19) and (22) that if $\nu(\mathcal{O}_2^A) = \{2,3,3\}$, then $\mathcal{O}_1^A \le \{2,3,3\}$ and $\chi(\mathcal{O}_1^A) = n/6$, where $n = \deg A$. It follows now from the classification of orbifolds of positive Euler characteristic that either $\mathcal{O}_1^A$ is the non-ramified sphere and $n = 12$, or one of the following conditions holds:

$$\mathcal{O}_1^A = \{3,3\},\ n = 4 \qquad \mathcal{O}_1^A = \{2,2\},\ n = 6$$

$$\mathcal{O}_1^A = \{2,2,2\},\ n = 3 \qquad \mathcal{O}_1^A = \{2,2,3\},\ n = 2.$$

Clearly, if $\mathcal{O}_1^A$ is non-ramified sphere, then $A = \theta_{\mathcal{O}_2^A}$ and

$$\mathcal{R}(A) = \Big(\{2,2,2,2,2,2\}_{z_1}, \{3,3,3,3\}_{z_2}, \{3,3,3,3\}_{z_3}\Big). \tag{33}$$

Consider now the case $\mathcal{O}_1^A = \{3,3\}$. Let $z_1, z_2, z_3 \in \mathbb{CP}^1$ be points such that

$$\nu_2^A(z_1) = 2, \quad \nu_2^A(z_3) = 3, \quad \nu_2^A(z_3) = 3.$$

Clearly, the definition of a covering map implies that for any $z \in A^{-1}\{z_1\}$ the multiplicity $\deg_z A$ equals 2. Thus, since $n = 4$, the set $A^{-1}\{z_1\}$ consists of two points of multiplicity 2. On the other hand, for any $z \in A^{-1}\{z_2\}$ the multiplicity $\deg_z A$ is equal either to 1 or to 3. The same is true for z_3. Therefore, taking into account that $n = 4$, we conclude that

$$\mathcal{R}(A) = \Big(\{2,2\}_{z_1}, \{1,3\}_{z_2}, \{1,3\}_{z_3}\Big). \tag{34}$$

Similarly, for $\nu(\mathcal{O}_1^A) = \{2,2\}$ we arrive to the branching

$$\mathcal{R}(A) = \Big(\{1,1,2,2\}_{z_1}, \{3,3\}_{z_2}, \{3,3\}_{z_3}\Big). \tag{35}$$

For $\nu(\mathcal{O}_1^A) = \{2,2,2\}$, we arrive to the branching

$$\mathcal{R}(A) = \Big(\{3\}_{z_2}, \{3\}_{z_3}\Big) \tag{36}$$

which does not satisfies the condition $\nu(\mathcal{O}_2^A) = \{2,3,3\}$. Finally, it is easy to see that (15) cannot be hold if

$$\nu(\mathcal{O}_1) = \{2,2,3\}, \quad \nu(\mathcal{O}_2) = \{2,3,3\}, \quad n = 2.$$

Thus, if $\nu(\mathcal{O}_2^A) = \{2,3,3\}$, the branchings of A is (33), (34), or (35). The explicit formulas may be found in [10]. Namely, assuming that

$$\nu(0) = 3, \quad \nu(1) = 2, \quad \nu(\infty) = 3,$$

we have, accordingly:

$$A = -\frac{1}{64}\frac{z^3(z^3-8)^3}{(z^3+1)^3} \circ \mu, \tag{37}$$

$$A = -\frac{1}{64}\frac{z(z-8)^3}{(z+1)^3} \circ \mu, \qquad A = -\frac{1}{64}\left(\frac{z^2-4}{z-1}\right)^3 \circ \mu, \tag{38}$$

where μ is a Möbius transformation.

For rational functions A which satisfy the condition $\chi(\mathcal{O}_2^A) = 0$ such an explicit description as above does not exist. In our exposition we only explain a link between these functions and Lattès functions, and make some further simple comments. Recall that a rational function A is called a Lattès function if there exist a sublattice Λ of $\mathbb{C}$ of rank two, an affine map $az + b$ from $\mathbb{C}/\Lambda$ to itself, and a holomorhpic map θ from $\mathbb{C}/\Lambda$ to $\mathbb{CP}^1$ such that the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbb{C}/\Lambda & \xrightarrow{az+b} & \mathbb{C}/\Lambda \\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle \theta} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \theta} \\ \mathbb{CP}^1 & \xrightarrow{A} & \mathbb{CP}^1 \end{array} \tag{39}$$

is commutative (see [8]). One can show however (see [8], Theorem 4.1) that this condition is equivalent to the requirement that there exists an orbifold $\mathcal{O}$ such that $A : \mathcal{O} \to \mathcal{O}$ is a covering map between orbifolds, and below we always will use this last characterization of Lattès functions as the basic one. By formula (19), if $A : \mathcal{O} \to \mathcal{O}$ is a covering map between orbifolds, then $\chi(\mathcal{O}) = 0$. Furthermore, in the fifth section we will show that, with a few exceptions, necessarily $\mathcal{O}_1^A = \mathcal{O}_2^A = \mathcal{O}$ and hence $\chi(\mathcal{O}_2^A) = 0$. Thus, Lattès functions provide a massive class of examples of functions A with $\chi(\mathcal{O}_2^A) = 0$. Still, other possibilities also exist. First, it is possible that $\chi(\mathcal{O}_2^A) = 0$ and $\nu(\mathcal{O}_1^A) = \nu(\mathcal{O}_2^A)$ but $\mathcal{O}_1^A \neq \mathcal{O}_2^A$ since $\mathcal{O}_1^A$ and $\mathcal{O}_2^A$ have different supports. Second, it is possible that $\nu(\mathcal{O}_1^A) \neq \nu(\mathcal{O}_2^A)$. Anyway, $\nu(\mathcal{O}_1^A) \leq \nu(\mathcal{O}_2^A)$ and $\chi(\mathcal{O}_1^A) = 0$, by (19). Say, if $\nu(\mathcal{O}_1^A) = \{2, 2, 2, 2\}$, then these conditions imply that $\nu(\mathcal{O}_2^A)$ is either $\{2, 2, 2, 2\}$, or $(2, 4, 4)$, or $(2, 3, 6)$. The following table lists all $\nu(\mathcal{O}_1)$ and $\nu(\mathcal{O}_2)$ such that $\nu(\mathcal{O}_1) \leq \nu(\mathcal{O}_2)$ and $\chi(\mathcal{O}_1) = \chi(\mathcal{O}_2) = 0$.

Table 1

	{2,2,2,2}	(3,3,3)	(2,4,4)	(2,3,6)
{2,2,2,2}	$\leq$		$\leq$	$\leq$
(3,3,3)		$\leq$		$\leq$
(2,4,4)			$\leq$	
(2,3,6)				$\leq$

3 Minimal maps between orbifolds of positive characteristic

In this section we study minimal holomorhic maps $A : \mathcal{O}_1 \to \mathcal{O}_2$ between orbifolds of positive characteristic. In particular, we show that for given $\mathcal{O}_1$ and $\mathcal{O}_2$ such a map exists if and only if a covering map between $\mathcal{O}_1$ and $\mathcal{O}_2$ exists.

The following statement is a generalization of Theorem 6.1 in [13].

Theorem 3.1. *Let $\mathcal{O}_1$ and $\mathcal{O}_2$ be orbifolds of positive Euler characteristic, $A : \mathcal{O}_1 \to \mathcal{O}_2$ a holomorphic map between orbifolds, and $F : \mathbb{CP}^1 \to \mathbb{CP}^1$ a rational function such that $A \circ \theta_{\mathcal{O}_1} = \theta_{\mathcal{O}_2} \circ F$. Then the following conditions are equivalent.*

1. *The map $A : \mathcal{O}_1 \to \mathcal{O}_2$ is a minimal holomorphic map between orbifolds.*
2. *The homomorphism $\varphi : \Gamma_{\mathcal{O}_1} \to \Gamma_{\mathcal{O}_2}$ in (18) is a monomorphism.*
3. *The functions F and $\theta_{\mathcal{O}_1}$ have no non-trivial common compositional right factor.*

Proof. Since $\theta_{\mathcal{O}_1} : \mathbb{CP}^1 \to \mathcal{O}_1$ is a covering map, Corollary 2.4 implies that any non-trivial compositional right factor of $\theta_{\mathcal{O}}$ has the form $\theta_{\mathcal{O}'}$ for the orbifold $\mathcal{O}' = A^*\mathcal{O}_2$. Therefore, the functions F and $\theta_{\mathcal{O}_1}$ have a non-trivial common compositional right factor if and only if there exists a subgroup $\Gamma_{\mathcal{O}'}$ of $\Gamma_{\mathcal{O}_1}$ such that $F(z_1) = F(z_2)$ whenever $z_2 = \sigma(z_1)$ for some $\sigma \in \Gamma_{\mathcal{O}'}$. On the other hand, such a subgroup exists if and only if φ is not a monomorphism.

By Lemma 2.7, in order to prove the equivalence $1 \Leftrightarrow 3$ it is enough to show that $A : \mathcal{O}_1 \to \mathcal{O}_2$ is a minimal holomorphic map between orbifolds if and only if $\deg_z \theta_{\mathcal{O}_1}$ and $\deg_z F$ are coprime for any $z \in \mathbb{CP}^1$. Since

$$\deg_z \theta_{\mathcal{O}_1} \deg_{\theta_{\mathcal{O}_1}(z)} A = \deg_z F \deg_{F(z)} \theta_{\mathcal{O}_2},$$

the equality

$$\mathrm{GCD}(\deg_z F, \deg_z \theta_{\mathcal{O}_1}) = 1$$

is equivalent to the equality

$$\deg_{F(z)} \theta_{\mathcal{O}_2} = \deg_z \theta_{\mathcal{O}_1} \mathrm{GCD}(\deg_{\theta_{\mathcal{O}_1}(z)} A, \deg_{F(z)} \theta_{\mathcal{O}_2}). \tag{40}$$

On the other hand, since $\deg_z \theta_{\mathcal{O}_1} = \nu_1(\theta_{\mathcal{O}_1}(z))$ and

$$\deg_{F(z)} \theta_{\mathcal{O}_2} = \nu_2(\theta_{\mathcal{O}_2}(F(z)) = \nu_2(A(\theta_{\mathcal{O}_1}(z)),$$

equality (40) holds for any $z \in \mathbb{CP}^1$ if and only if the equality

$$\nu_2(A(z)) = \nu_1(z) \mathrm{GCD}(\deg_z A, \nu_2(A(z))$$

holds for any $z \in \mathbb{CP}^1$, that is if and only if $A : \mathcal{O}_1 \to \mathcal{O}_2$ is a minimal holomorphic map between orbifolds. □

Theorem 3.2. *Let $\mathcal{O}_1$ and $\mathcal{O}_2$ be orbifolds such that $\chi(\mathcal{O}_1) > 0$, $\chi(\mathcal{O}_2) > 0$, and $A : \mathcal{O}_1 \to \mathcal{O}_2$ a minimal holomorhic map. Then A can be decomposed into a composition $A = X \circ Y$ of rational functions X and Y such that $Y : \mathcal{O}_1 \to \mathcal{O}_1$ is a minimal holomorhic map and $X : \mathcal{O}_1 \to \mathcal{O}_2$ is a covering map.*

Proof. Applying the first part of Proposition 2.1, we can find a rational function F such that

$$A \circ \theta_{\mathcal{O}_1} = \theta_{\mathcal{O}_2} \circ F, \tag{41}$$

and equality (18) holds for some homomorphism $\varphi : \Gamma_{\mathcal{O}_1} \to \Gamma_{\mathcal{O}_2}$. Since $\varphi(\Gamma_{\mathcal{O}_1})$ is a subgroup of $\Gamma_{\mathcal{O}_2}$, there exist an orbifold $\mathcal{O}$, such that $\varphi(\Gamma_{\mathcal{O}_1}) = \Gamma_{\mathcal{O}}$, and a rational function X such that $\theta_{\mathcal{O}_2} = X \circ \theta_{\mathcal{O}}$. Further, by Theorem 3.1, the groups $\Gamma_{\mathcal{O}_1}$ and $\Gamma_{\mathcal{O}}$ are isomorphic. Since both groups are finite subgroups of the automorphism group of $\mathbb{CP}^1$, this implies that

$$\theta_{\mathcal{O}} = \mu_1 \circ \theta_{\mathcal{O}_1} \circ \mu_2,$$

for some Möbius transformations μ_1 and μ_2. Thus, changing if necessary the function F to $\mu_2 \circ F$, the function $\theta_{\mathcal{O}_2}$ to $\theta_{\mathcal{O}_2} \circ \mu_2^{-1}$, and the function X to $X \circ \mu_1$, without loss of generality we may assume that $\Gamma_{\mathcal{O}_1} = \Gamma_{\mathcal{O}}$ and $\theta_{\mathcal{O}_1} = \theta_{\mathcal{O}}$ so that

$$\theta_{\mathcal{O}_2} = X \circ \theta_{\mathcal{O}_1}. \tag{42}$$

Applying now the second part of Proposition 2.1 to F and $\varphi : \Gamma_{\mathcal{O}_1} \to \Gamma_{\mathcal{O}_1}$, we may find a rational function Y such that

$$Y \circ \theta_{\mathcal{O}_1} = \theta_{\mathcal{O}_1} \circ F.$$

Furthermore, $Y : \mathcal{O}_1 \to \mathcal{O}_1$ is a minimal holomorphic map between orbifolds by Theorem 3.1. It follows now from

$$X \circ Y \circ \theta_{\mathcal{O}_1} = X \circ \theta_{\mathcal{O}_1} \circ F = \theta_{\mathcal{O}_2} \circ F$$

and (41) that $F = X \circ Y$.

Clearly, $X : X^*\mathcal{O}_2 \to \mathcal{O}_2$ is a covering map. Finally, applying Theorem 2.3 to (42) we see that $\theta_{\mathcal{O}_1} : \mathbb{CP}^1 \to X^*\mathcal{O}_2$ is a covering map (here $\mathbb{CP}^1$ stands for the corresponding non-ramified orbifold). Thus, $\theta_{\mathcal{O}_1}$ is a universal covering map for both orbifolds $X^*\mathcal{O}_2$ and $\mathcal{O}_1$, implying that $X^*\mathcal{O}_2 = \mathcal{O}_1$. □

Notice that if $\nu(\mathcal{O}_1) = \nu(\mathcal{O}_2)$, then the degree of the rational function X provided by Theorem 3.2 is one. However, if $\nu(\mathcal{O}_1) \neq \nu(\mathcal{O}_2)$, then necessarily $\deg X > 1$.

Corollary 3.3. *Let $\mathcal{O}_1$ and $\mathcal{O}_2$ be orbifolds such that $\chi(\mathcal{O}_1) > 0$, $\chi(\mathcal{O}_2) > 0$. Then a minimal holomorphic map between $\mathcal{O}_1$ and $\mathcal{O}_2$ exists if an only if a covering map between $\mathcal{O}_1$ and $\mathcal{O}_2$ exists.* □

Corollary 3.4. *Let $A : \mathcal{O}_1 \to \mathcal{O}_2$ be a minimal holomorphic map between orbifolds such that $\chi(\mathcal{O}_1) > 0$, $\chi(\mathcal{O}_2) > 0$. Assume that $\nu(\mathcal{O}_2) = \{n, n\}$, $n \geq 2$. Then $\nu(\mathcal{O}_1) = (d, d)$ for some $d \mid n$. On the other hand, if $\nu(\mathcal{O}_2) = \{2, 2, n\}$, $n \geq 2$, then either $\nu(\mathcal{O}_1) = (d, d)$ for some $d \mid n$, or $\nu(\mathcal{O}_1) = (2, 2, d)$ for some $d \mid n$.*

Proof. By Corollary 3.3, there exists a covering map $\widetilde{A} : \mathcal{O}_1 \to \mathcal{O}_2$. Since by Corollary 2.4 the composition $\widetilde{A} \circ \theta_{\mathcal{O}_1} : \mathbb{CP}^1 \to \mathcal{O}_2$ is a covering map, we conclude that $\widetilde{A} \circ \theta_{\mathcal{O}_1} = \theta_{\mathcal{O}_2}$. Thus, $\widetilde{A}$ is a compositional left factor of $\theta_{\mathcal{O}_2}$. If say $\nu(\mathcal{O}_2) = \{2, 2, n\}$, $n \geq 2$, then possible decompositions of $\theta_{\mathcal{O}_2}$ are given by formulas (29), (30). In the first case, equality $\mathcal{O}_1 = \widetilde{A}^* \mathcal{O}_2$ implies that $\nu(\mathcal{O}_1) = (d, d)$, $d \mid n$, while in the second that $\nu(\mathcal{O}_1) = (2, 2, d)$, $d \mid n$. If $\nu(\mathcal{O}_2) = \{n, n\}$, $n \geq 2$, the proof is obtained similarly with the use of (28). □

Corollary 3.5. *Let A, C, D, B be a good solution of* (13) *such that $\chi(\mathcal{O}_2^A) > 0$, $\chi(\mathcal{O}_2^B) > 0$.*

- *If $A \underset{\mu}{\sim} z^n$, then $B \underset{\mu}{\sim} z^n$.*
- *If $A \underset{\mu}{\sim} \frac{1}{2}\left(z^n + z^{-n}\right)$, then $B \underset{\mu}{\sim} \frac{1}{2}\left(z^n + z^{-n}\right)$.*
- *If $A \underset{\mu}{\sim} T_n$, then either $B \underset{\mu}{\sim} T_n$, or $B \underset{\mu}{\sim} z^n$, or $B \underset{\mu}{\sim} \frac{1}{2}\left(z^{n/2} + z^{-n/2}\right)$.*

Proof. By Theorem 2.8, $D : \mathcal{O}_2^B \to \mathcal{O}_2^A$ is a minimal holomorphic map between orbifolds. If $A \underset{\mu}{\sim} z^n$, then Corollary 3.4 implies that $\nu(\mathcal{O}_2^B) = (d, d)$ for some $d | n$. Thus, $B \underset{\mu}{\sim} z^d$. Moreover, $d = n$, since

$$\deg A = \deg B. \tag{43}$$

If $A \underset{\mu}{\sim} \frac{1}{2}\left(z^n + z^{-n}\right)$, then Corollary 3.4 implies that either $\nu(\mathcal{O}_2^B) = (d, d)$ for some $d \mid n$, or $\nu(\mathcal{O}_2^B) = (2, 2, d)$ for some $d \mid n$. Furthermore, (43) implies that the first case is impossible. On the other hand, since $\nu(\mathcal{O}_2^A) = (2, 2, d)$ yields that either $B \underset{\mu}{\sim} \frac{1}{2}\left(z^l + z^{-l}\right)$ or $A \underset{\mu}{\sim} T_l$, where $l \mid d$, in the second case (43) implies that $d = n$ and $B \underset{\mu}{\sim} \frac{1}{2}\left(z^n + z^{-n}\right)$.

Finally, if $A \underset{\mu}{\sim} T_n$, then as in the previous case either $\nu(\mathcal{O}_2^B) = (d, d)$ for some $d \mid n$, or $\nu(\mathcal{O}_2^B) = (2, 2, d)$ for some $d \mid n$. It follows now from (43) that in the first case $d = n$ and $B \underset{\mu}{\sim} z^n$, while in the second one either $d = n$ and $B \underset{\mu}{\sim} T_n$, or $d = n/2$ and $B \underset{\mu}{\sim} \frac{1}{2}\left(z^{n/2} + z^{-n/2}\right)$. □

Remark 3.6. All the possibilities provided by Corollary 3.5 are really realizable as the following identities show (see e.g. [12]):

$$z^n \circ z^r R(z^n) = z^r R^n(z) \circ z^n, \quad R \in \mathbb{C}(z), \quad \mathrm{GCD}(r, n) = 1,$$

$$\frac{1}{2}\left(z^n + \frac{1}{z^n}\right) \circ z^m = T_m \circ \frac{1}{2}\left(z^n + \frac{1}{z^n}\right), \quad \mathrm{GCD}(n, m) = 1,$$

$$T_n \circ T_m = T_m \circ T_n, \quad \mathrm{GCD}(n, m) = 1,$$

$$-T_{2n} \circ \frac{1}{2}\left(\varepsilon z^m + \frac{1}{\varepsilon z^m}\right) = T_{2m} \circ \frac{1}{2}\left(z^n + \frac{1}{z^n}\right), \quad \varepsilon^{2n} = -1, \quad \mathrm{GCD}(n, m) = 1.$$

Corollary 3.7. *Let $\mathcal{O}$ be an orbifold, and $F : \mathcal{O} \to \mathcal{O}$ a minimal holomorphic map. Then for any decomposition $F = A \circ B$ of F into a composition of rational functions the equality $\nu(A^*\mathcal{O}) = \nu(\mathcal{O})$ holds.*

Proof. By Proposition 2.2, $\chi(\mathcal{O}) \geq 0$. Further, Theorem 2.3 implies that

$$\nu(\mathcal{O}) \leq \nu(A^*\mathcal{O}) \leq \nu(\mathcal{O}).$$

If $\chi(\mathcal{O}) = 0$, then a direct analysis of Table 1 shows that this is possible only if $\nu(A^*\mathcal{O}) = \nu(\mathcal{O})$.

In the case $\chi(\mathcal{O}) > 0$ the proof essentially coincides with the proof of Corollary 5.1 in the paper [13]. Set $\mathcal{O}' = A^*\mathcal{O}$. It follows from Corollary 2.5 and Proposition 2.1 that there exist holomorphic maps F_U and F_V which make the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \widetilde{\mathcal{O}} & \xrightarrow{F_V} & \widetilde{\mathcal{O}}' & \xrightarrow{F_U} & \widetilde{\mathcal{O}} \\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle \theta_{\mathcal{O}}} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \theta_{\mathcal{O}'}} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \theta_{\mathcal{O}}} \\ \mathcal{O} & \xrightarrow{V} & \mathcal{O}' & \xrightarrow{U} & \mathcal{O} \end{array}$$

commutative. Since $\chi(\mathcal{O}) \leq \chi(\mathcal{O}')\deg F_V$ by Proposition 2.2, the inequality $\chi(\mathcal{O}') > 0$ holds, implying that $\widetilde{\mathcal{O}}' = \mathbb{CP}^1$. Furthermore, there exist homomorphisms

$$\varphi_V : \Gamma_{\mathcal{O}} \to \Gamma_{\mathcal{O}'}, \quad \varphi_U : \Gamma_{\mathcal{O}'} \to \Gamma_{\mathcal{O}}$$

such that

$$F_V \circ \sigma = \varphi_V(\sigma) \circ F_V, \quad \sigma \in \Gamma_{\mathcal{O}}, \qquad F_U \circ \sigma = \varphi_U(\sigma) \circ F_U, \quad \sigma \in \Gamma_{\mathcal{O}'}.$$

Since the function $F_U \circ F_V$ makes the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \widetilde{\mathcal{O}} & \xrightarrow{F_U \circ F_V} & \widetilde{\mathcal{O}} \\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle \theta_{\mathcal{O}}} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \theta_{\mathcal{O}}} \\ \mathcal{O} & \xrightarrow{A} & \mathcal{O} \end{array}$$

commutative and the group $\Gamma_{\mathcal{O}}$ is finite, Theorem 3.1 implies that the composition of homomorphisms

$$\varphi_U \circ \varphi_V : \Gamma_{\mathcal{O}} \to \Gamma_{\mathcal{O}}$$

is an automorphism. Therefore, $\Gamma_{\mathcal{O}'} \cong \Gamma_{\mathcal{O}}$ and $\nu(\mathcal{O}_1) = \nu(\mathcal{O}_2)$. □

Corollary 3.8. *Let F be a special rational function and G a rational function such that $G \sim F$. Then G is special. More precisely, if F is conjugated to $z^{\pm n}$, then G is conjugated to $z^{\pm n}$, if F is conjugated to $\pm T_n$, then G is conjugated to $\pm T_n$, and if F is a Lattès function, then G is a Lattès function.*

Proof. Since any decomposition of z^n is given by (28), if F is conjugated to $z^{\pm n}$, then any elementary transformation of F is conjugated to $z^{\pm n}$, implying that G is conjugated to $z^{\pm n}$. Similarly, if F is conjugated to $\pm T_n$, then G is conjugated to $\pm T_n$, since any decomposition of T_n is given by (31).

Finally, if F is a Lattès function, then there exists an orbifold $\mathcal{O}$ of characteristic zero such that $F : \mathcal{O} \to \mathcal{O}$ is a holomorhic map, and Theorem 3.7 implies that for any decomposition $F = A \circ B$ the equality $\chi(A^*\mathcal{O}) = \chi(\mathcal{O}) = 0$ holds. Since Corollary 2.5 and Corollary 2.4 imply that $B \circ A : A^*\mathcal{O} \to A^*\mathcal{O}$ is a holomorhic map, we conclude that any elementary transformation of F is a Lattès function, implying that G is a Lattès function. □

4 Minimal self-maps between orbifolds of positive characteristic

Let $A : \mathcal{O} \to \mathcal{O}$ be a minimal holomorhic map between orbifolds. Then Proposition 2.2 implies that $\chi(\mathcal{O}) \geq 0$, and $\chi(\mathcal{O}) = 0$ if and only if $A : \mathcal{O} \to \mathcal{O}$ is a covering map. As it was mentioned above, the class of covering self-maps between orbifolds coincides with the class of Lattès functions. So, in this section we assume that $\chi(\mathcal{O}) > 0$, and establish some basic properties of minimal holomorhic self-maps between orbifolds in this case. Notice that if $\deg A = 1$, then obviously $A : \mathcal{O} \to \mathcal{O}$ is a minimal holomorphic map between orbifolds if and only if $A : \mathcal{O} \to \mathcal{O}$ is a covering map, that is if and only if $\mu \in \mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{O})$.

We start from a description of minimal holomorhic maps $A : \mathcal{O} \to \mathcal{O}$ in the case where $\nu(\mathcal{O}) = \{n, n\}$, $n \geq 2$. To be definite, we normalize $\mathcal{O}$ as follows:

$$\nu(0) = n, \quad \nu(\infty) = n. \tag{44}$$

Proposition 4.1. *Let $\mathcal{O}$ be an orbifold defined by equality* (44) *and A a rational function. Then $A : \mathcal{O} \to \mathcal{O}$ is a minimal holomorhic map between orbifolds if and only if $A = z^r R^n(z)$, where $R \in \mathbb{C}(z)$, $1 \leq r \leq n-1$, and* $\mathrm{GCD}(r, n) = 1$.

Proof. By Theorem 3.1, minimal holomorhic map between orbifolds $A : \mathcal{O} \to \mathcal{O}$ correspond to functions F satisfying (18) for some automorphism $\varphi : \Gamma_{\mathcal{O}} \to \Gamma_{\mathcal{O}}$. For $\mathcal{O}$ defined by (44) the group $\Gamma_{\mathcal{O}} = \mathbb{Z}_n$ is generated by the transformation

$$E_n : z \to e^{2\pi i/n} z, \tag{45}$$

and the function $\theta_{\mathcal{O}}$ has the form $\theta_{\mathcal{O}} = z^n$. Since a homomorphism $\varphi : \Gamma_{\mathcal{O}} \to \Gamma_{\mathcal{O}}$ is an automorphism if and only if

$$\varphi(E_n) : z \to e^{2\pi i r/n} z, \tag{46}$$

where $1 \leq r \leq n-1$ and $\mathrm{GCD}(r, n) = 1$, we conclude that F satisfies (18) if and only if F/z^r is $\Gamma_{\mathcal{O}}$-invariant for some r as above. Thus, $F = z^r R(z^n)$, $R \in \mathbb{C}(z)$. Since the function $f = z^r R^n(z)$ makes corresponding diagram (17) commutative, this proves the statement. □

Denote by $\mathfrak{T}$ the set of rational functions commuting with the transformation

$$T : z \to \frac{1}{z}.$$

Since the equality $G(z)G(1/z) = 1$ implies that whenever a point $a \in \mathbb{CP}^1$ is a zero of G of order k, the point $1/a \in \mathbb{CP}^1$ is a pole of G of order k, it is easy to see that a rational function G belongs to $\mathfrak{T}$ if and only if

$$G = \pm\frac{(z-a_1)^{l_1}(z-a_2)^{l_2}\dots(z-a_s)^{l_s}}{(a_1z-1)^{l_1}(a_2z-1)^{l_2}\dots(a_sz-1)^{l_s}},$$

where $a_1, a_2, \dots a_s \in \mathbb{C}$ and $l_1, l_2, \dots l_s \in \mathbb{Z}$.

The next statement describes minimal holomorhic maps $A : \mathcal{O} \to \mathcal{O}$ in the case where $\nu(\mathcal{O}) = \{2, 2, n\}$, $n \geq 2$, and

$$\nu(-1) = 2, \quad \nu(1) = 2, \quad \nu(\infty) = n. \tag{47}$$

Proposition 4.2. *Let $\mathcal{O}$ be an orbifold defined by equality* (47) *and A a rational function. Then $A : \mathcal{O} \to \mathcal{O}$ is a minimal holomorhic map between orbifolds if and only if*

$$A = \pm\frac{1}{2}\left(z^rS^n(z) \circ (z + \sqrt{z^2-1}) + z^rS^n(z) \circ (z - \sqrt{z^2-1})\right) \tag{48}$$

where $S \in \mathfrak{T}$, $1 \leq r \leq n-1$, and $\mathrm{GCD}(r, n) = 1$.

Proof. For $\mathcal{O}$ defined by (47) the corresponding group $\Gamma_{\mathcal{O}} = D_n$ is generated by the transformations E_n and T, and the function $\theta_{\mathcal{O}}$ has the form

$$\theta_{\mathcal{O}} = \frac{1}{2}\left(z^n + \frac{1}{z^n}\right). \tag{49}$$

Since elements of order n in $\Gamma_{\mathcal{O}}$ are E_n^r, where $1 \leq r \leq n-1$ and $\mathrm{GCD}(r, n) = 1$, for any automorphism $\varphi : \Gamma_{\mathcal{O}} \to \Gamma_{\mathcal{O}}$ condition (46) holds, implying that any rational function F satisfying (18) has the form $F = z^rR(z^n)$, where $R \in \mathbb{C}(z)$, $1 \leq r \leq n-1$, and $\mathrm{GCD}(r, n) = 1$. Furthermore, since elements of order 2 in $\Gamma_{\mathcal{O}}$ are E_n^jT, $0 \leq j \leq n-1$, we have:

$$F(1/z) = e^{\frac{2\pi i}{n}j}\frac{1}{F(z)}, \qquad 0 \leq j \leq n-1. \tag{50}$$

Therefore,

$$R(z^n)R(1/z^n) = e^{\frac{2\pi i}{n}j},$$

implying that $e^{-\frac{\pi i}{n}j}R \in \mathfrak{T}$. Thus,

$$F = \varepsilon z^rS(z^n), \tag{51}$$

where $S \in \mathfrak{T}$, $\varepsilon^{2n} = 1$, $1 \leq r \leq n-1$, and $\mathrm{GCD}(r, n) = 1$. In other direction, any such F obviously satisfies (18) for some automorphism $\varphi : \Gamma_{\mathcal{O}} \to \Gamma_{\mathcal{O}}$.

Finally, the equality

$$A\circ\frac{1}{2}\left(z^n+\frac{1}{z^n}\right)=\frac{1}{2}\left(z^n+\frac{1}{z^n}\right)\circ\varepsilon z^r S(z^n)=\frac{1}{2}\left(z+\frac{1}{z}\right)\circ\pm z^r S^n(z)\circ z^n, \quad (52)$$

is equivalent to the equality

$$A\circ\frac{1}{2}\left(z+\frac{1}{z}\right)=\frac{1}{2}\left(z+\frac{1}{z}\right)\circ\pm z^r S^n(z)=\pm\frac{1}{2}\left(z^r S^n(z)+(z^r S^n(z))\circ\frac{1}{z}\right)$$

which in its turn is equivalent to equality (48). □

The next proposition describes all *polynomial* minimal holomorhic maps between orbifolds $P:\mathcal{O}\to\mathcal{O}$ with $\chi(\mathcal{O})>0$.

Proposition 4.3. *Let $\mathcal{O}$ be an orbifold with $\chi(\mathcal{O})>0$ and P a polynomial of degree at least two such that $P:\mathcal{O}\to\mathcal{O}$ is a minimal holomorhic map between orbifolds. Then either $\nu(\mathcal{O})=\{n,n\}$, $n\geq 2$, and P is conjugated to $z^r R^n(z)$, where $R\in\mathbb{C}[z]$, $1\leq r\leq n-1$, and $\mathrm{GCD}(r,n)=1$, or $\nu(\mathcal{O})=(2,2,n)$, $n\geq 2$, and P is conjugated to $\pm T_m$, where $\mathrm{GCD}(m,n)=1$.*

Proof. Set $m=\deg P$. If the set $c(\mathcal{O})$ consists of two points, then the proposition follows from Proposition 4.1, so assume that $c(\mathcal{O})=\{z_1,z_2,z_3\}$ and

$$\nu(z_1)=d_1,\quad \nu(z_2)=d_2,\quad \nu(z_3)=d_3.$$

Since (12) implies that for any point $z\in P^{-1}\{z_1,z_2,z_3\}$ but three, the number $\deg_z f$ is divisible either by d_1, or by d_2, or by d_3, and $d_1,d_2,d_3\geq 2$, the set $P^{-1}\{z_1,z_2,z_3\}$ contains at most

$$(3m-3)/2+3=1.5m+1.5$$

points. On the other hand, if f is a rational function of degree m and $S\subset\mathbb{CP}^1$ is a set containing k points, then the Riemann-Hurwitz formula

$$\sum_{z\in\mathbb{CP}^1}(\deg_z f-1)=2m-2 \quad (53)$$

implies easily that

$$|f^{-1}\{S\}|\geq(k-2)m+2, \quad (54)$$

where the equality attains if and only if S contains all critical values of f. In particular, if P is a polynomial and $S\subset\mathbb{C}$, then

$$|P^{-1}\{S\}|\geq(k-1)m+1, \quad (55)$$

where the equality attains if and only if S contains all finite critical values of P. Since

$$1.5m+1.5<2m+1$$

whenever $m\geq 2$, this implies that at least one of the points z_1,z_2,z_3 is infinity. Assume say that $z_3=\infty$.

Since P is a polynomial, it follows from (12) that $\mathrm{GCD}(d_3, m) = 1$. Furthermore, since for any point $z \in P^{-1}\{z_1, z_2\}$ but two, the number $\deg_z P$ is divisible either by d_1, or by d_2, the inequality

$$|P^{-1}\{z_1, z_2\}| \leq (2m-2)/2 + 2 = m + 1 \tag{56}$$

holds. By (55), this is possible only if in (56) attains the equality, implying that $d_1 = d_2 = 2$, and that for any point $z \in P^{-1}\{z_1, z_2\}$ besides of z_1 and z_2 the equality $\deg_z P = 2$ holds, while $\deg_{z_1} P = \deg_{z_2} P = 1$. It is well known that these conditions imply that P is conjugated to $\pm T_m$. This is also a corollary of the above considerations. Indeed, the equality $P \circ \theta_{\mathcal{O}} = \theta_{\mathcal{O}} \circ F$, where $\theta_{\mathcal{O}}$ is given by (49), implies that the set $\{0, \infty\} = \theta_{\mathcal{O}}^{-1}\{\infty\}$ is completely invariant with respect to F given by (51). Thus, $F = \varepsilon z^m$, where $\varepsilon^{2n} = 1$, and hence

$$P = \pm\frac{1}{2}\left((z + \sqrt{z^2-1})^m + (z - \sqrt{z^2-1})^m\right) = \pm T_m. \qquad \square$$

It is clear that if $D : \mathcal{O} \to \mathcal{O}$ is a minimal holomorhic map between orbifolds, then $D(c(\mathcal{O})) \subseteq c(\mathcal{O})$. In fact, the following stronger statement holds.

Proposition 4.4. *Let $\mathcal{O}$ be an orbifold with $\chi(\mathcal{O}) > 0$, and D a rational function such that $D : \mathcal{O} \to \mathcal{O}$ is a minimal holomorhic map between orbifolds. Then for any $z \in c(\mathcal{O})$ the equality $\nu(D(z)) = \nu(z)$ holds.*

Proof. Assume first that $\nu(\mathcal{O}) = \{2, 3, 5\}$, and let z_1, z_2, $z_3 \in \mathbb{CP}^1$ be points such that

$$\nu(z_1) = 2, \quad \nu(z_2) = 3, \quad \nu(z_3) = 5. \tag{57}$$

In this notation, it follows directly from (21) that

$$D(z_1) = z_1, \quad D(z_2) = z_2, \quad D(z_3) = z_3 \tag{58}$$

and therefore the lemma is true. Similarly, the lemma is true if $\nu(\mathcal{O}) = \{2, 3, 3\}$, if $\nu(\mathcal{O}) = \{n, n\}$, where $n \geq 2$, and if $\nu(\mathcal{O}) = (2, 2, n)$ where $n = 2$ or odd.

If the collection of ramification indices of $\mathcal{O}$ is $(2, 3, 4)$ and z_1, z_2, $z_3 \in \mathbb{CP}^1$ are points such that

$$\nu(z_1) = 2, \quad \nu(z_2) = 3, \quad \nu(z_3) = 4, \tag{59}$$

then (21) implies that either (58) holds or

$$D(z_1) = z_3, \quad D(z_2) = z_2, \quad D(z_3) = z_3. \tag{60}$$

However, (60) is impossible. Indeed, if (60) holds, then (21) implies that

$$\mathrm{GCD}(\deg_{z_1} D, 4) = 2, \quad \mathrm{GCD}(\deg_{z_3} D, 4) = 1,$$

and at the points of $D^{-1}\{z_3\}$ distinct from z_1, z_3 the local multiplicity of D is divisible by 4. Therefore,

$$\deg D = \sum_{z \in D^{-1}\{z_3\}} \deg_z D \tag{61}$$

is odd. On the other hand, (60) implies that the local multiplicity of D at any point of $D^{-1}\{z_1\}$ is even implying that $\deg D$ is even, and the contradiction obtained shows that (60) is impossible.

Assume finally that the collection of ramification indices of $\mathcal{O}$ is $(2,2,n)$, where $n=2k$, $k>1$, and let z_1, z_2,, $z_3 \in \mathbb{CP}^1$ be points such that

$$\nu(z_1)=2, \quad \nu(z_2)=2, \quad \nu(z_3)=n. \tag{62}$$

Clearly,

$$D(z_3)=z_3, \tag{63}$$

so in order to prove the lemma in this case we only must show that

$$D\{z_1,z_2\} \subseteq \{z_1,z_2\}. \tag{64}$$

Observe first that the equality

$$D(z_1)=D(z_2)=D(z_3)=z_3 \tag{65}$$

is impossible. Indeed, otherwise (21) implies that

$$\mathrm{GCD}(\deg_{z_1} D,n)=k, \quad \mathrm{GCD}(\deg_{z_2} D,n)=k, \quad \mathrm{GCD}(\deg_{z_3} D,n)=1,$$

and at the points of $D^{-1}\{z_3\}$ distinct from z_1, z_2, z_3 the local multiplicity of D is divisible by n. Since n is even, it follows from

$$\mathrm{GCD}(\deg_{z_1} D,n)=\mathrm{GCD}(\deg_{z_2} D,n)$$

that either the numbers $\deg_{z_1} D$, $\deg_{z_2} D$ both are even, or they both are odd. In either case, the right part of equality (61) is odd, in contradiction with the evenness of $\deg D$.

Similar considerations show that the assumptions

$$D(z_1) \subset \{z_1,z_2\}, \quad D(z_2)=D(z_3), \tag{66}$$

and

$$D(z_2) \subset \{z_1,z_2\}, \quad D(z_1)=D(z_3),$$

also lead to a contradiction. Indeed, if say (66) holds and $D(z_1)=z_1$, then (21) implies that $\deg_{z_1} D$ is odd while at the points of $D^{-1}\{z_1\}$ distinct from z_1 the local multiplicity of D is even, implying that $\deg D$ is odd. On the other hand, at all the points of $D^{-1}\{z_2\}$ the local multiplicity of D is even, implying that $\deg D$ is even. □

Remark 4.5. If $\nu(\mathcal{O})=(2,2,2)$, the proposition becomes trivial. However, the above proof still shows that equality (65) is impossible, implying that there exists $z_0 \in c(\mathcal{O})$ such that $D^{-1}\{z_0\} \cap c(\mathcal{O})$ consists of a unique point.

The following statement relates critical values of minimal holomorphic self-map between orbifolds of positive characteristic with ramification sets of corresponding orbifolds.

Lemma 4.6. *Let $\mathcal{O}$ be an orbifold such that $\chi(\mathcal{O}) > 0$, and D a rational function of degree at least two. Assume that $D : \mathcal{O} \to \mathcal{O}$ is a minimal holomorphic map between orbifolds. Then $c(\mathcal{O}) \subseteq c(\mathcal{O}_2^D)$, unless* $\deg D = 2$.

Proof. Assume that $z_1 \in c(\mathcal{O})$ is not a critical value of D. Then (21) implies that for any point $z \in D^{-1}\{z_1\}$ the equality $\nu(z) = \nu(z_1)$ holds. Hence, $\deg D < 4$ for otherwise $c(\mathcal{O})$ contains at least four points in contradiction with $\chi(\mathcal{O}) > 0$. Furthermore, if $\deg D = 3$, then it follows from the classification of orbifolds of positive characteristic that necessarily $\nu(\mathcal{O}) = \{2, 2, 2\}$, and $c(\mathcal{O}) = D^{-1}\{z_1\}$. Therefore, if $z' \in c(\mathcal{O})$ is distinct from z_1, then for any $z \in D^{-1}\{z'\}$ the local multiplicity of D at z is divisible by 2. However, this is impossible since the sum of local multiplicities of D over all the points from $D^{-1}\{z'\}$ is equal to $\deg D = 3$. □

5 Exceptional Lattès functions

In this section, we consider self-covering maps $A : \mathcal{O} \to \mathcal{O}$ between orbifolds of zero Euler characteristic, that is the Lattès functions. We show that, as a rule, for such A and $\mathcal{O}$ the equality $\mathcal{O}_2^A = \mathcal{O}_1^A = \mathcal{O}$ holds, and list all exceptions. In fact, we will consider a bit more general situation.

Theorem 5.1. *Let A be a rational function and $\mathcal{O}_1$, $\mathcal{O}_2$ orbifolds. Assume that $\chi(\mathcal{O}_1) = \chi(\mathcal{O}_2) = 0$ and $A : \mathcal{O}_1 \to \mathcal{O}_2$ is a covering map between orbifolds. Then either $\chi(\mathcal{O}_2^A) = 0$ and $\mathcal{O}_2 = \mathcal{O}_2^A$, $\mathcal{O}_1 = \mathcal{O}_1^A$, or $\chi(\mathcal{O}_2^A) > 0$ and one of the following conditions holds:*

1. $$\nu(\mathcal{O}_2^A) = \{2, 2\}, \quad A \underset{\mu}{\sim} z^2, \quad \nu(\mathcal{O}_1) = \nu(\mathcal{O}_2) = \{2, 2, 2, 2\},$$

2. $$\nu(\mathcal{O}_2^A) = \{2, 2\}, \quad A \underset{\mu}{\sim} z^2, \quad \nu(\mathcal{O}_1) = \nu(\mathcal{O}_2) = \{2, 4, 4\},$$

3. $$\nu(\mathcal{O}_2^A) = \{2, 2\}, \quad A \underset{\mu}{\sim} z^2, \quad \nu(\mathcal{O}_1) = \{2, 2, 2, 2\}, \quad \nu(\mathcal{O}_2) = \{2, 4, 4\},$$

4. $$\nu(\mathcal{O}_2^A) = \{2, 2\}, \quad A \underset{\mu}{\sim} z^2, \quad \nu(\mathcal{O}_1) = \{3, 3, 3\}, \quad \nu(\mathcal{O}_2) = \{2, 3, 6\},$$

5. $$\nu(\mathcal{O}_2^A) = \{3, 3\}, \quad A \underset{\mu}{\sim} z^3, \quad \nu(\mathcal{O}_1) = \nu(\mathcal{O}_2) = \{3, 3, 3\},$$

6. $$\nu(\mathcal{O}_2^A) = \{3, 3\}, \quad A \underset{\mu}{\sim} z^3, \quad \nu(\mathcal{O}_1) = \{2, 2, 2, 2\}, \quad \nu(\mathcal{O}_2) = \{2, 3, 6\},$$

7. $$\nu(\mathcal{O}_2^A) = \{4, 4\}, \quad A \underset{\mu}{\sim} z^4, \quad \nu(\mathcal{O}_1) = \{2, 2, 2, 2\}, \quad \nu(\mathcal{O}_2) = \{2, 4, 4\},$$

8. $\nu(\mathcal{O}_2^A) = \{2,2,2\}, \quad A \underset{\mu}{\sim} \frac{1}{2}\left(z^2 + \frac{1}{z^2}\right), \quad \nu(\mathcal{O}_1) = \nu(\mathcal{O}_2) = \{2,2,2,2\},$

9. $\nu(\mathcal{O}_2^A) = \{2,2,2\}, A \underset{\mu}{\sim} \frac{1}{2}\left(z^2 + \frac{1}{z^2}\right), \nu(\mathcal{O}_1) = \{2,2,2,2\}, \nu(\mathcal{O}_2) = \{2,4,4\},$

10. $\nu(\mathcal{O}_2^A) = \{2,2,3\}, \ A \underset{\mu}{\sim} \frac{1}{2}\left(z^3 + \frac{1}{z^3}\right), \ \nu(\mathcal{O}_1) = \{3,3,3\}, \ \nu(\mathcal{O}_2) = \{2,3,6\},$

11. $\nu(\mathcal{O}_2^A) = \{2,2,3\}, \quad A \underset{\mu}{\sim} T_3, \quad \nu(\mathcal{O}_1) = \nu(\mathcal{O}_2) = \{2,3,6\},$

12. $\nu(\mathcal{O}_2^A) = \{2,2,4\}, A \underset{\mu}{\sim} \frac{1}{2}\left(z^4 + \frac{1}{z^4}\right), \nu(\mathcal{O}_1) = \{2,2,2,2\}, \nu(\mathcal{O}_2) = \{2,4,4\},$

13. $\nu(\mathcal{O}_2^A) = \{2,2,4\}, \quad A \underset{\mu}{\sim} T_4, \quad \nu(\mathcal{O}_1) = \{2,2,2,2\}, \quad \nu(\mathcal{O}_2) = \{2,4,4\},$

14. $\nu(\mathcal{O}_2^A) = \{2,2,4\}, \quad A \underset{\mu}{\sim} T_4, \quad \nu(\mathcal{O}_1) = \nu(\mathcal{O}_2) = \{2,4,4\},$

15. $\nu(\mathcal{O}_2^A) = \{2,3,3\}, \quad A \underset{\mu}{\sim} -\frac{1}{64}\frac{z(z-8)^3}{(z+1)^3}, \quad \nu(\mathcal{O}_1) = \nu(\mathcal{O}_2) = \{2,3,6\}.$

16. $$\nu(\mathcal{O}_2^A) = \{2,3,3\}, \quad A \underset{\mu}{\sim} -\frac{1}{64}\left(\frac{z^2-4}{z-1}\right)^3,$$
$$\nu(\mathcal{O}_1) = \{2,2,2,2\}, \quad \nu(\mathcal{O}_2) = \{2,3,6\},$$

17. $$\nu(\mathcal{O}_2^A) = \{2,3,3\}, \quad A \underset{\mu}{\sim} -\frac{1}{64}\frac{z^3(z^3-8)^3}{(z^3+1)^3},$$
$$\nu(\mathcal{O}_1) = \{2,2,2,2\}, \quad \nu(\mathcal{O}_2) = \{2,3,6\},$$

Proof. Since $A: \mathcal{O}_1 \to \mathcal{O}_2$ is a covering map between orbifolds,

$$\mathcal{O}_2^A \preceq \mathcal{O}_2, \tag{67}$$

by (25). Clearly, (67) implies that $\chi(\mathcal{O}_2^A) \geq \chi(\mathcal{O}_2)$, and the equality attains if and only if $\mathcal{O}_2^A = \mathcal{O}_2$. Therefore, the conditions

$$\chi(\mathcal{O}_2) = 0 \tag{68}$$

and (67) imply that $\chi(\mathcal{O}_2^A) \geq 0$. Moreover, if $\chi(\mathcal{O}_2^A) = 0$, then $\mathcal{O}_2 = \mathcal{O}_2^A$, implying that

$$\mathcal{O}_1^A = A^*\mathcal{O}_2^A = A^*\mathcal{O}_2 = \mathcal{O}_1.$$

Thus, we may assume that $\chi(\mathcal{O}_2^A) > 0$. Finally, (67) and (68) imply that either $\nu(\mathcal{O}_2^A) = \{n, n\}$, $n \leq 4$, or $\nu(\mathcal{O}_2^A) = \{2, 2, n\}$, $n \leq 4$, or $\nu(\mathcal{O}_2^A) = \{2, 3, 3\}$.

Case 1: $\boldsymbol{\nu(\mathcal{O}_2^A) = \{n, n\}}$. If $n = 2$, then $\mathcal{O}_2^A \preceq \mathcal{O}_2$ implies that $\nu(\mathcal{O}_2)$ is either $\{2, 2, 2, 2\}$, or $\{2, 4, 4\}$, or $\{2, 3, 6\}$. Assume say that $\nu(\mathcal{O}_2) = \{2, 4, 4\}$ and let $x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2, y_3 \in \mathbb{CP}^1$ be points such that

$$\nu_A(x_1) = 2, \quad \nu_A(x_2) = 2, \tag{69}$$

$$\nu(y_1) = 2, \quad \nu(y_2) = 4, \quad \nu(y_3) = 4,$$

where ν_A (resp. ν) is the ramification function of $\mathcal{O}_2^A$ (resp. of $\mathcal{O}_2$). It is clear that either

$$\{x_1, x_2\} = \{y_1, y_2\},$$

or

$$\{x_1, x_2\} = \{y_1, y_3\},$$

or

$$\{x_1, x_2\} = \{y_2, y_3\}.$$

Further, since (69) implies that

$$\mathcal{R}(A) = (\{2\}_{x_1}, \{2\}_{x_2}),$$

it follows from (15) that in the first two cases

$$\nu(\mathcal{O}_1) = \nu(A^*\mathcal{O}_2) = \{2, 4, 4\},$$

while in the third one

$$\nu(\mathcal{O}_1) = \nu(A^*\mathcal{O}_2) = \{2, 2, 2, 2\}.$$

Thus, we arrive to cases 2 and 3 listed in the theorem.

Similarly, if $\nu(\mathcal{O}_2) = \{2, 3, 6\}$ and $y_1, y_2, y_3 \in \mathbb{CP}^1$ are points such that

$$\nu(y_1) = 2, \quad \nu(y_2) = 3, \quad \nu(y_3) = 6,$$

then

$$\{x_1, x_2\} = \{y_2, y_3\}$$

and

$$\nu(\mathcal{O}_1) = \nu(A^*\mathcal{O}_2) = \{3, 3, 3\}.$$

Finally, if $\nu(\mathcal{O}_2) = \{2, 2, 2, 2\}$ we conclude that

$$\nu(\mathcal{O}_1) = \nu(A^*\mathcal{O}_2) = \{2, 2, 2, 2\}.$$

The cases $n = 3$ and $n = 4$ are considered in the same way as above. Namely, if $\nu(\mathcal{O}_2^A) = \{3, 3\}$, then $\nu(\mathcal{O}_2)$ is either $\{3, 3, 3\}$, or $\{2, 3, 6\}$, and we arrive to cases 5 and 6, correspondingly, while if $\nu(\mathcal{O}_2^A) = \{4, 4\}$, then $\nu(\mathcal{O}_2) = \{2, 4, 4\}$ and we arrive to case 7.

Case 2: $\nu(\mathcal{O}_2^A) = \{2, 2, n\}$. The proof goes as above with some modifications. Assume say that $n = 3$. Then $\nu(\mathcal{O}_2) = \{2, 3, 6\}$, and if $x_1, x_2, x_3, y_1, y_2, y_3 \in \mathbb{CP}^1$ are points such that

$$\nu_A(x_1) = 2, \quad \nu_A(x_2) = 2, \quad \nu_A(x_3) = 3,$$

$$\nu(y_1) = 2, \quad \nu(y_2) = 3, \quad \nu(y_3) = 6,$$

then

$$\{x_1, x_2\} = \{y_1, y_3\}, \quad x_3 = y_2.$$

Now however we must consider two types of branching of A corresponding to the possibilities $A \underset{\mu}{\sim} \frac{1}{2}(z^3 + z^{-3})$ and $A \underset{\mu}{\sim} T_3$. In the first case

$$\mathcal{R}(A) = \Big(\{2, 2, 2\}_{x_1}, \{2, 2, 2\}_{x_2}, \{3, 3\}_{x_3}\Big),$$

in the second

$$\mathcal{R}(A) = \Big(\{1, 2\}_{x_1}, \{1, 2\}_{x_2}, \{3\}_{x_3}\Big).$$

Correspondingly, either

$$\nu(\mathcal{O}_1) = \nu(A^*\mathcal{O}_2) = \{3, 3, 3\}.$$

or

$$\nu(\mathcal{O}_1) = \nu(A^*\mathcal{O}_2) = \{2, 3, 6\}.$$

Similarly, if $n = 4$, then $\nu(\mathcal{O}_2) = \{2, 4, 4\}$, and either

$$\mathcal{R}(A) = \Big(\{2, 2, 2, 2\}_{x_1}, \{2, 2, 2, 2\}_{x_2}, \{4, 4\}_{x_3}\Big),$$

or

$$\mathcal{R}(A) = \Big(\{1, 1, 2\}_{x_1}, \{2, 2\}_{x_2}, \{4\}_{x_3}\Big), \tag{70}$$

or

$$\mathcal{R}(A) = \Big(\{2, 2\}_{x_1}, \{1, 1, 2\}_{x_2}, \{4\}_{x_3}\Big). \tag{71}$$

In the first case,

$$\nu(\mathcal{O}_1) = \{2, 2, 2, 2\},$$

while in each of cases (70) and (71), either

$$\nu(\mathcal{O}_1) = \{2, 2, 2, 2\}, \tag{72}$$

or

$$\nu(\mathcal{O}_1) = \{2, 4, 4\}. \tag{73}$$

Say, if (70) holds, and $y_1, y_2, y_3 \in \mathbb{CP}^1$ are the points such that

$$\nu(y_1) = 2, \quad \nu(y_2) = 4, \quad \nu(y_3) = 4,$$

then (72) holds if $x_1 = y_1$, while (73) holds if $x_1 = y_2$ or $x_1 = y_3$.

Finally, if $n = 2$, then $A \underset{\mu}{\sim} \frac{1}{2}(z^2 + z^{-2})$, and $\nu(\mathcal{O}_2)$ is either $\{2, 2, 2, 2\}$ or $\{2, 4, 4\}$. In both cases

$$\nu(\mathcal{O}_1) = \{2, 2, 2, 2\}$$

and we arrive to cases 8 and 9, correspondingly.

Case 3: $\nu(\mathcal{O}_2^A) = \{2, 3, 3\}$. In this case $\nu(\mathcal{O}_2) = \{2, 3, 6\}$, and considering possible branching for A given by (33), (34), (35) we arrive to the cases 17, 15, 16, correspondingly. □

Corollary 5.2. *Let A be a rational function and $\mathcal{O}_1$, $\mathcal{O}_2$ orbifolds such that $\nu(\mathcal{O}_1) = \nu(\mathcal{O}_2)$ and $A : \mathcal{O}_1 \to \mathcal{O}_2$ is a covering map between orbifolds. Then either $\chi(\mathcal{O}_2^A) = 0$ and $\mathcal{O}_2 = \mathcal{O}_2^A$, $\mathcal{O}_1 = \mathcal{O}_1^A$, or $\chi(\mathcal{O}_2^A) > 0$ and one of the following conditions holds:*

1. $\nu(\mathcal{O}_2^A) = \{2, 2\}, \quad A \underset{\mu}{\sim} z^2, \quad \nu(\mathcal{O}_1) = \nu(\mathcal{O}_2) = \{2, 2, 2, 2\},$

2. $\nu(\mathcal{O}_2^A) = \{2, 2\}, \quad A \underset{\mu}{\sim} z^2, \quad \nu(\mathcal{O}_1) = \nu(\mathcal{O}_2) = \{2, 4, 4\},$

3. $\nu(\mathcal{O}_2^A) = \{3, 3\}, \quad A \underset{\mu}{\sim} z^3, \quad \nu(\mathcal{O}_1) = \nu(\mathcal{O}_2) = \{3, 3, 3\},$

4. $\nu(\mathcal{O}_2^A) = \{2, 2, 2\}, \quad A \underset{\mu}{\sim} \dfrac{1}{2}\left(z^2 + \dfrac{1}{z^2}\right), \quad \nu(\mathcal{O}_1) = \nu(\mathcal{O}_2) = \{2, 2, 2, 2\},$

5. $\nu(\mathcal{O}_2^A) = \{2, 2, 3\}, \quad A \underset{\mu}{\sim} T_3, \quad \nu(\mathcal{O}_1) = \nu(\mathcal{O}_2) = \{2, 3, 6\},$

6. $\nu(\mathcal{O}_2^A) = \{2, 2, 4\}, \quad A \underset{\mu}{\sim} T_4, \quad \nu(\mathcal{O}_1) = \nu(\mathcal{O}_2) = \{2, 4, 4\},$

7. $\nu(\mathcal{O}_2^A) = \{2, 3, 3\}, \quad A \underset{\mu}{\sim} -\dfrac{1}{64}\dfrac{z(z-8)^3}{(z+1)^3}, \quad \nu(\mathcal{O}_1) = \nu(\mathcal{O}_2) = \{2, 3, 6\}.$ □

Corollary 5.3. *Let A be a rational function of degree greater than 4 and $\mathcal{O}_1$, $\mathcal{O}_2$ orbifolds such that $\nu(\mathcal{O}_1) = \nu(\mathcal{O}_2)$ and $A : \mathcal{O}_1 \to \mathcal{O}_2$ is a covering map between orbifolds. Then $\mathcal{O}_2 = \mathcal{O}_2^A$, $\mathcal{O}_1 = \mathcal{O}_1^A$.*

6 Special good solutions of $A \circ D = C \circ B$

In this section we describe (Theorem 6.4) good solutions of the equation

$$A \circ C = D \circ B \tag{74}$$

satisfying the additional conditions

$$\nu(\mathcal{O}_2^A) = \nu(\mathcal{O}_2^B), \quad \nu(\mathcal{O}_2^C) = \nu(\mathcal{O}_2^D), \tag{75}$$

and

$$\chi(\mathcal{O}_2^A) > 0, \quad \chi(\mathcal{O}_2^D) > 0. \tag{76}$$

Notice that any pair of commuting functions A, D gives rise to a solution of (74) satisfying (75), so condition (75) can be thought of as a relaxation of the commutativity condition. Further, since $A : \mathcal{O}_2^C \to \mathcal{O}_2^D$ and $D : \mathcal{O}_2^B \to \mathcal{O}_2^A$ are minimal holomorphic maps between orbifolds by Theorem 2.8, it follows from (75) by Proposition 2.2 that

$$\chi(\mathcal{O}_2^A) \geq 0, \quad \chi(\mathcal{O}_2^D) \geq 0.$$

Thus, condition (76) means that we exclude from the consideration Lattès functions unless they are exceptional in the sense of the previous section.

Lemma 6.1. *Let D be a rational function of degree at least two, and $\mathcal{O}$ an orbifold such that $D : \mathcal{O} \to \mathcal{O}$ is a minimal holomorphic map between orbifolds. Assume that $\chi(\mathcal{O}) > 0$. Then $\mathcal{O} \neq \mathcal{O}_2^D$.*

Proof. Since $D : \mathcal{O} \to \mathcal{O}$ is a minimal holomorphic map and $D : \mathcal{O}_1^D \to \mathcal{O}_2^D$ is a covering map, the equalities

$$\mathcal{O} = D^*\mathcal{O}, \quad \mathcal{O}_1^D = D^*\mathcal{O}_2^D$$

hold. Therefore, if $\mathcal{O} = \mathcal{O}_2^D$, then $\mathcal{O} = \mathcal{O}_1^D$ and hence $D : \mathcal{O} \to \mathcal{O}$ in fact is a covering map between orbifolds. However, in this case (19) implies that $\chi(\mathcal{O}) = 0$ in contradiction with the assumption. □

Lemma 6.2. *Let D be a rational function of degree at least two, and $\mathcal{O}$ an orbifold such that $D : \mathcal{O} \to \mathcal{O}$ is a minimal holomorphic map between orbifolds. Assume that $\nu(\mathcal{O}) = \{2, 3, 5\}$ or $\nu(\mathcal{O}) = \{2, 3, 4\}$. Then $\chi(\mathcal{O}_2^D) < 0$.*

Proof. In order to lighten the notation set $\widetilde{\mathcal{O}} = \mathcal{O}_2^D$ and denote by $\widetilde{\nu}$ the corresponding ramification function. Assume that $\nu(\mathcal{O}) = \{2, 3, 5\}$ and let $z_1, z_2, z_3 \in \mathbb{CP}^1$ be points such that equalities (57) hold. By Proposition 4.4, $D(z_3) = z_3$, and it follows from (21) that for any point $z \in D^{-1}\{z_3\}$ distinct from z_3 the local multiplicity $\deg_z D$ is divisible by 5. Moreover, the set $D^{-1}\{z_3\}$ contains at least one point distinct from z_3. Indeed, otherwise $D \underset{\mu}{\sim} P$ for some polynomial P, and this is impossible by Proposition 4.3. Therefore,

$$\widetilde{\nu}(z_3) = 5k, \quad k \geq 1. \tag{77}$$

Similarly, we conclude that

$$\widetilde{\nu}(z_1) = 2r, \quad \widetilde{\nu}(z_2) = 3l, \quad r, l \geq 1. \tag{78}$$

It follows now from equalities (77), (78) and the classification of orbifolds of non-negative Euler characteristic that $\chi(\widetilde{\mathcal{O}}) < 0$, unless $\nu(\widetilde{\mathcal{O}}) = \{2, 3, 5\}$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{O}} = \mathcal{O}$. The last equality however contradicts Lemma 6.1.

If $\nu(\mathcal{O}) = \{2, 3, 4\}$ and $z_1, z_2, z_3 \in \mathbb{CP}^1$ are points such that (59) holds, then we conclude similarly that

$$\widetilde{\nu}(z_1) = 2r, \quad \widetilde{\nu}(z_2) = 3l, \quad \widetilde{\nu}(z_3) = 4k, \quad r, k, l \geq 1,$$

implying that $\chi(\widetilde{\mathcal{O}}) < 0$. □

Lemma 6.2 shows that if $\nu(\mathcal{O}) = \{2, 3, 5\}$ or $\nu(\mathcal{O}) = \{2, 3, 4\}$, then there exists no minimal holomorphic maps between orbifolds $D : \mathcal{O} \to \mathcal{O}$ such that $\nu(\mathcal{O}_2^D) > 0$. The next lemma describes minimal holomorphic maps $D : \mathcal{O} \to \mathcal{O}$ with $\nu(\mathcal{O}_2^D) > 0$ in the case where $\nu(\mathcal{O}) = \{2, 3, 3\}$, and $\mathcal{O}$ is normalized as follows:

$$\nu(1) = 2, \quad \nu(0) = 3, \quad \nu(\infty) = 3. \tag{79}$$

Set

$$\Delta = \frac{27z}{(4z-1)^3}.$$

We have:

$$\mathcal{R}(\Delta) = \Big(\{1, 2\}_1, \{1, 2\}_0, \{3\}_\infty\Big), \tag{80}$$

and

$$\begin{gathered} \Delta^{-1}\{1\} = \{1, -1/8\}, \quad \deg_1 \Delta = 1, \quad \deg_{-1/8} \Delta = 2, \\ \Delta^{-1}\{0\} = \{0, \infty\}, \quad \deg_0 \Delta = 1, \quad \deg_\infty \Delta = 2, \\ \Delta^{-1}\{\infty\} = \{1/4\}, \quad \deg_{1/4} \Delta = 3, \end{gathered} \tag{81}$$

implying that $\Delta : \mathcal{O} \to \mathcal{O}$ is a minimal holomorphic map between orbifolds. Clearly, condition (80) implies that $\Delta \underset{\mu}{\sim} T_3$. In particular, any function whose branching is given by the right part of (80) has the form $\Delta \circ \mu$ for some Möbius transformation μ.

Lemma 6.3. *Let D be a rational function of degree at least two, and $\mathcal{O}$ an orbifold, defined by equalities* (79)*. Assume that $\chi(\mathcal{O}_2^D) > 0$ and $D : \mathcal{O} \to \mathcal{O}$ is a minimal holomorphic map between orbifolds. Then $D = \Delta \circ z^{\pm 1}$.*

Proof. As above, set $\widetilde{\mathcal{O}} = \mathcal{O}_2^D$ and denote by $\widetilde{\nu}$ the corresponding ramification function. If

$$D(1) = 1, \quad D(0) = 0, \quad D(\infty) = \infty$$

or

$$D(1) = 1, \quad D(0) = \infty, \quad D(\infty) = 0,$$

then we conclude as in Lemma 6.2 that

$$\widetilde{\nu}(1) = 2r, \quad \widetilde{\nu}(0) = 3l, \quad \widetilde{\nu}(\infty) = 3k, \qquad r, k, l \geq 1, \tag{82}$$

implying that $\chi(\widetilde{\mathcal{O}})$ cannot be positive.

Assume now that

$$D(1) = 1, \quad D(0) = D(\infty) = 0 \tag{83}$$

(the rest case

$$D(1) = 1, \quad D(0) = D(\infty) = \infty$$

is considered in the same way). The first of equalities (83) implies in the same way as above that

$$\widetilde{\nu}(1) = 2r, \quad r \geq 1. \tag{84}$$

On the other hand, the second one implies that for any point $z \in D^{-1}\{\infty\}$ the local multiplicity $\deg_z D$ is divisible by 3, implying that

$$\widetilde{\nu}(\infty) = 3k, \quad k \geq 1. \tag{85}$$

Since Proposition 4.3 implies that $D \underset{\mu}{\not\sim} z^2$, it follows from Lemma 4.6 that $c(\mathcal{O}) \subseteq c(\widetilde{\mathcal{O}})$. Therefore, $c(\mathcal{O}) = c(\widetilde{\mathcal{O}})$ since the condition $\chi(\widetilde{\mathcal{O}}) > 0$ implies that $\nu(\widetilde{\mathcal{O}})$ contains at most three points. Thus, $\widetilde{\nu}(0) > 1$ and (84) and (85) imply that either $\widetilde{\nu}(0) = 2$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{O}} = \{2, 2, 3\}$, or $\widetilde{\nu}(0) = 3$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{O}} = \{2, 3, 3\}$. Since in the last case we arrive to (82), we conclude that

$$\widetilde{\nu}(1) = 2, \qquad \widetilde{\nu}(0) = 2, \quad \widetilde{\nu}(\infty) = 3, \tag{86}$$

implying that either

$$\mathcal{R}(D) = \Big(\{2, 2, 2\}_1, \{2, 2, 2\}_0, \{3, 3\}_\infty\Big),$$

or

$$\mathcal{R}(D) = \Big(\{1, 2\}_1, \{1, 2\}_0, \{3\}_\infty\Big).$$

In the first case $D : \mathcal{O} \to \mathcal{O}$ is not a minimal holomorphic map between orbifolds since $\nu(D^*\mathcal{O}) = \{3, 3, 3\}$. On the other hand, in the second case $D = \Delta \circ \mu$ for some Möbius transformation μ. Finally, since $\Delta : \mathcal{O} \to \mathcal{O}$ is a minimal holomorphic map, it follows from Corollary 2.5 that $\mu \in \mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{O}) = \{z^{\pm 1}\}$. □

Theorem 6.4. *Let A, C, D, B be rational functions of degree at least two which form a good solution of* (74) *satisfying* (75) *and* (76). *Then there exist Möbius transformations α, β, μ_1, μ_2 such that, up to a possible replacement of A to D and of C to B, one of the following conditions holds:*

i) $A = \alpha \circ z^{m_1} \circ \mu_1, \quad C = \mu_1^{-1} \circ z^{m_2} \circ \beta, \quad D = \alpha \circ z^{m_2} \circ \mu_2, \quad B = \mu_2^{-1} \circ z^{m_1} \circ \beta,$

where $m_1 \geq 2$, $m_2 \geq 2$, *and* $\mathrm{GCD}(m_1, m_2) = 1$,

ii) $A = \alpha \circ T_{m_1} \circ \mu_1, \quad C = \mu_1^{-1} \circ T_{m_2} \circ \beta, \quad D = \alpha \circ T_{m_2} \circ \mu_2, \quad B = \mu_2^{-1} \circ T_{m_1} \circ \beta,$

where $m_1 \geq 2$, $m_2 \geq 2$, *and* $\mathrm{GCD}(m_1, m_2) = 1$,

iii)
$$A = \alpha \circ -\frac{64z(z-1)^3}{(8z+1)^3} \circ \mu_1, \quad C = \mu_1^{-1} \circ \frac{27z}{(4z-1)^3} \circ \beta,$$

$$D = \alpha \circ \frac{27z}{(4z-1)^3} \circ \mu_2, \quad B = \mu_2^{-1} \circ -\frac{64z(z-1)^3}{(8z+1)^3} \circ \beta,$$

iv)
$$A = \alpha \circ T_2 \circ \mu_1, \quad C = \mu_1^{-1} \circ \frac{1}{2}\left(z^m + \frac{1}{z^m}\right) \circ \beta,$$

$$D = \alpha \circ \frac{1}{2}\left(z^m + \frac{1}{z^m}\right) \circ \mu_2, \quad B = \mu_2^{-1} \circ z^2 \circ \beta,$$

where m *is odd.*

Proof. Set

$$m_1 = \deg A, \quad m_2 = \deg D.$$

Since $\chi(\mathcal{O}_2^A) > 0$, the set $\nu(\mathcal{O}_2^A)$ contains at most three points. Therefore, changing D and B to $D \circ \mu$ and $\mu^{-1} \circ B$ for a convenient Möbius transformation μ, we may assume that $\mathcal{O}_2^B = \mathcal{O}_2^A$. Similarly, we may assume that $\mathcal{O}_2^C = \mathcal{O}_2^D$. In order to lighten the notation, set

$$\mathcal{O} = \mathcal{O}_2^A = \mathcal{O}_2^B, \quad \widetilde{\mathcal{O}} = \mathcal{O}_2^D = \mathcal{O}_2^C.$$

Since, by Theorem 2.8, $A : \widetilde{\mathcal{O}} \to \widetilde{\mathcal{O}}$ and $D : \mathcal{O} \to \mathcal{O}$ are minimal holomorphic maps between orbifolds, it follows from Lemma 6.2 that

$$\nu(\mathcal{O}) \neq \{2,3,5\}, \quad \nu(\mathcal{O}) \neq \{2,3,4\},$$

and

$$\nu(\widetilde{\mathcal{O}}) \neq \{2,3,5\}, \quad \nu(\widetilde{\mathcal{O}}) \neq \{2,3,4\}.$$

Assume that at least one of the orbifolds $\mathcal{O}$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{O}}$ has the collection of ramification indices $\{2,3,3\}$. Without loss of generality we can assume that $\nu(\mathcal{O}) = \{2,3,3\}$, and $\mathcal{O}$ is defined by equalities (79). Then Lemma 6.3 implies that $\widetilde{\mathcal{O}}$ is defined by equalities (86) and $D = \Delta \circ \mu_1$, where $\mu_1 \in \mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{O})$. Furthermore, it follows from (79), by classification from Subsection 2.3, that the branching of A has one of the following forms

$$\mathcal{R}(A) = \Big(\{2,2,2,2,2,2\}_1, \{3,3,3,3\}_0, \{3,3,3,3\}_\infty\Big),$$

$$\mathcal{R}(A) = \Big(\{1,1,2,2\}_1, \{3,3\}_0, \{3,3\}_\infty\Big),$$

$$\mathcal{R}(A) = \Big(\{2,2\}_1, \{1,3\}_0, \{1,3\}_\infty\Big). \tag{87}$$

However, since $A : \widetilde{\mathcal{O}} \to \widetilde{\mathcal{O}}$ is a minimal holomorphic maps between orbifolds, only (87) is possible since in the first two cases $\nu(A^*\widetilde{\mathcal{O}}) = \{2,2,2,2\}$.

Set

$$\Gamma = -\frac{64z(z-1)^3}{(8z+1)^3}.$$

A direct calculation shows that $\Gamma : \widetilde{\mathcal{O}} \to \widetilde{\mathcal{O}}$ is a minimal holomorphic map between orbifolds since

$$\Gamma^{-1}\{0\} = \{0,1\}, \quad \deg{}_0\Gamma = 1, \quad \deg{}_1\Gamma = 3,$$

$$\Gamma^{-1}\{\infty\} = \{\infty, -1/8\}, \quad \deg{}_\infty\Gamma = 1, \quad \deg{}_{-1/8}\Gamma = 3, \tag{88}$$

$$\Gamma^{-1}\{1\} = \left\{-\frac{5}{4}-\frac{3}{4}\sqrt{3}\,,\ -\frac{5}{4}+\frac{3}{4}\sqrt{3}\right\}, \quad \deg{}_{-\frac{5}{4}-\frac{3}{4}\sqrt{3}}\Gamma = 2, \quad \deg{}_{-\frac{5}{4}+\frac{3}{4}\sqrt{3}}\Gamma = 2.$$

Clearly,

$$\mathcal{R}(\Gamma) = \Big(\{2,2\}_1, \{1,3\}_0, \{1,3\}_\infty\Big), \tag{89}$$

and Γ is obtained from the first function in (38) by the change $z \to 8z$. Thus, if (87) holds, then $A = \Gamma \circ \mu_2$, where $\mu_2 \in \mathrm{Aut}(\widetilde{\mathcal{O}})$.

Since the degrees of Γ and Δ are coprime, the algebraic curve $\Gamma(x)-\Delta(y) = 0$ is irreducible (see e.g. [12], Proposition 3.1). Furthermore, it has genus zero and a proper parametrization $x = \Delta(t)$ and $y = \Gamma(t)$. Thus, by Lemma 2.6, we obtain a good solution of (74) satisfying conditions of the theorem. Finally, since a proper parametrization of a rational curve is defined in a unique way up to a composition with a Möbius transformation, any other solution of (74) with $\nu(\mathcal{O}) = \{2,3,3\}$ is given by formulas iii).

Notice that in correspondence with the Ritt theorem the functions Δ and Γ as well as the function

$$\Omega = \frac{1728(z-1)^3(8z+1)^6 z}{(64z^3-48z^2+228z-1)^3(4z-1)^3} = \Gamma\circ\Delta = \Delta\circ\Gamma, \tag{90}$$

whose branching is

$$\Big(\{1,2,3,6\}_0, \{2,2,2,2,2,2\}_1, \{3,3,3,3\}_\infty\Big), \tag{91}$$

are Lattès functions. Namely, it is easy to see that they are covering self-maps for $\bar{\mathcal{O}}$ defined by equalities

$$\bar\nu(0) = 6, \quad \bar\nu(1) = 2, \quad \bar\nu(\infty) = 3.$$

From now one we may assume that the branching of D has one of the following forms:

$$\mathcal{R}(D) = \Big(\{2,2,\dots,2\}_{z_1}, \{2,2,\dots,2\}_{z_2}, \{m_2,m_2\}_{z_3}\Big), \tag{92}$$

$$\mathcal{R}(D) = \Big(\{1,2,2,\dots,2\}_{z_1}, \{1,2,2,\dots,2\}_{z_2}, \{m_2\}_{z_3}\Big), \tag{93}$$

$$\mathcal{R}(D) = \Big(\{1,1,2,\dots,2\}_{z_1}, \{2,2,\dots,2\}_{z_2}, \{m_2\}_{z_3}\Big), \tag{94}$$

$$\mathcal{R}(D) = \Big(\{m_2\}_{z_1}, \{m_2\}_{z_2}\Big), \tag{95}$$

and that the branching of any of the functions A, C, B also has one of the forms above (for C and B, with m_1 instead of m_2).

Assume that (92) holds. Observe first that $c(\mathcal{O})$ is a subset of $D^{-1}\{z_1, z_2, z_3\}$. Indeed, since $D : \mathcal{O} \to \mathcal{O}$ is a minimal holomorphic map, $D(c(\mathcal{O})) \subseteq c(\mathcal{O})$. On the other hand, since (92) implies that $\deg D \geq 4$, Lemma 4.6 implies that $c(\mathcal{O}) \subseteq c(\widetilde{\mathcal{O}})$. Further, it follows from (92) and (21) that for each j, $1 \leq j \leq 3$, and any $z, z' \in D^{-1}\{z_j\}$ the equality $\nu(z) = \nu(z')$ holds. Therefore, since the cardinalities of the sets $D^{-1}\{z_j\}$, $1 \leq j \leq 3$, are even, the cardinality of $c(\mathcal{O})$ cannot be equal three implying that $\nu(\mathcal{O}) = \{m_1, m_1\}$. Furthermore, it is easy to see that $D : \mathcal{O} \to \mathcal{O}$ is a minimal holomorphic self-map for such $\mathcal{O}$ if and only if $m_1 = 2$, m_2 is odd, and either

$$\nu(z_1) = 2, \quad \nu(z_3) = 2, \tag{96}$$

or

$$\nu(z_2) = 2, \quad \nu(z_3) = 2. \tag{97}$$

Set $z_1 = -1$, $z_2 = 1$, $z_3 = \infty$. Then (92) implies that without loss of generality we may assume that

$$D = \frac{1}{2}\left(z^{m_2} + \frac{1}{z^{m_2}}\right).$$

On the other hand, (96) and (97) imply that without loss of generality we may assume that $A = T_2$ and $A = -T_2$, correspondingly. Furthermore, we may assume that $A = T_2$, since $D(-z) = -D(z)$. Since m_2 is odd, the algebraic curves

$$\frac{1}{2}\left(x^{m_2} + \frac{1}{x^{m_2}}\right) - T_2(y) = 0$$

is irreducible. Furthermore, it has genus zero and the parametrization

$$x = t^2, \qquad y = \frac{1}{2}\left(t^{m_2} + \frac{1}{t^{m_2}}\right).$$

Therefore, any good solution of (74) for which (92) holds is given by iv).

Assume now that (93) or (94) holds. Without loss of generality we may assume that $z_1 = -1$, $z_2 = 1$, $z_3 = \infty$ and $D = \pm T_{m_2}$. Furthermore, since we may exchange A and D, we may assume that $A \underset{\mu}{\not\sim} 1/2\,(z^{m_1} + 1/z^{m_1})$. Since this assumption implies that A is μ-equivalent to a polynomial, and $A : \widetilde{\mathcal{O}} \to \widetilde{\mathcal{O}}$ is a minimal holomorphic map between orbifolds, it follows from Proposition 4.3 that without loss of generality we may assume that $A = \pm T_{m_2}$, where $\mathrm{GCD}(m_1, m_2) = 1$. Thus, m_1 and m_2 cannot be both even and hence without loss of generality we may assume that $A = T_{m_1}$, $D = T_{m_2}$, since for odd s

the equality $-T_s = T_s \circ (-z)$ holds. Since m and n are coprime, the curve $T_{m_1}(x) - T_{m_2}(y) = 0$ is irreducible. Furthermore, it has genus zero and can be parametrized by $x = T_{m_2}(t)$ and $y = T_{m_1}(t)$. Therefore, any good solution of (74) for which (93) or (94) holds is given by ii).

Finally, if (95) holds, then by symmetry we may assume that $A \underset{\mu}{\sim} z^{m_1}$. It follows now easily from from Proposition 4.3 that in this case any good solution is given by i). □

7 Stable chains

Define a *chain* $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}(s, d)$ of length $s \geq 2$ as a sequence of $s - 1$ equalities

$$U_i \circ V_i = V_{i+1} \circ U_{i+1}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq s-1, \tag{98}$$

where U_i, V_i, $1 \leq i \leq s$, are rational functions of degree at least two. Clearly, any such a chain corresponds to a sequence of s elementary transformations

$$F \to F_1 \to \cdots \to F_s, \tag{99}$$

where

$$F = V_1 \circ U_1, \quad F_i = U_i \circ V_i, \qquad 1 \leq i \leq s.$$

The function $F = V_1 \circ U_1$ is called the basis of $\mathcal{C}$, and the common degree d of the functions F_i, $0 \leq i \leq s$, is called the degree of $\mathcal{C}$.

It is easy to see that there exist chains whose length is as big as we want. For example, if we allow decompositions in (98) to be equivalent, we can include in (99) any function conjugated to F. On the other hand, even considering only chains for which the functions in each of equalities (98) form a good solution of (13), we can obtain infinite chains starting from commuting functions A and B, and setting $U_i = A$, $V_i = B$, $i \geq 1$. In this and the next section we prove one of the main results of the paper: the finiteness of any chain whose basis is non-special and the functions in each of equalities (98) form a good solution of (13) (Theorem 8.6).

Any chain (98) gives rise to the following commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc}
 & \vdots & & \vdots & & \vdots & & \vdots & \\
\ldots & \mathbb{CP}^1 & \xrightarrow{U_2} & \mathbb{CP}^1 & \xrightarrow{U_3} & \mathbb{CP}^1 & \xrightarrow{U_4} & \mathbb{CP}^1 & \\
 & \downarrow{\scriptstyle V_1} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle V_2} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle V_3} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle V_4} & \\
 & \mathbb{CP}^1 & \xrightarrow{U_1} & \mathbb{CP}^1 & \xrightarrow{U_2} & \mathbb{CP}^1 & \xrightarrow{U_3} & \mathbb{CP}^1 & \\
 & & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle V_1} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle V_2} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle V_3} & \\
 & & & \mathbb{CP}^1 & \xrightarrow{U_1} & \mathbb{CP}^1 & \xrightarrow{U_2} & \mathbb{CP}^1 & \\
 & & & & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle V_1} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle V_2} & \\
 & & & & & \mathbb{CP}^1 & \xrightarrow{U_1} & \mathbb{CP}^1\,. &
\end{array} \tag{100}$$

For a chain $\mathcal{C}$ given by (98) set

$$V_{i,j} = V_i \circ V_{i+1} \circ \cdots \circ V_j, \quad U_{i,j} = U_j \circ U_{j-1} \circ \cdots \circ U_i, \quad 1 \le i \le j \le s.$$

Clearly, (100) implies that for any i, j_1, j_2, $1 \le i \le j_1 \le s$, $1 \le i \le j_2 \le s$, the equality

$$U_{i,j_1} \circ V_{i,j_2} = V_{j_1+1,j_1+j_2-i+1} \circ U_{j_2+1,j_1+j_2-i+1}$$

holds. For a chain $\mathcal{C}$ given by (98) define its *dual* chain $\mathcal{C}'$ by formulas

$$U_i = V_{s+1-i}, \quad V_i = U_{s+1-i}, \quad 1 \le i \le s.$$

On diagram (100) this chain corresponds to the move from the top right corner to the top left one.

A chain $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}(s, d)$ is called *good* if in each of equalities (98) the corresponding functions form a good solution of (13). For a good chain $\mathcal{C}$ set

$$d_1 = \deg U_1 = \deg U_2 = \cdots = \deg U_s,$$

and

$$d_2 = \deg V_1 = \deg V_2 = \cdots = \deg V_s.$$

These numbers are well defined by Lemma 2.6, and obviously satisfy the equality $d_1 d_2 = d$. Furthermore, if $\mathcal{C}$ is a good chain, then, by Theorem 2.8,

$$V_{i+1} : \mathcal{O}_2^{U_{i+1}} \to \mathcal{O}_2^{U_i}, \quad U_i : \mathcal{O}_2^{V_i} \to \mathcal{O}_2^{V_{i+1}}, \quad 1 \le i \le s-1, \tag{101}$$

and

$$V_i : \mathcal{O}_1^{U_{i+1}} \to \mathcal{O}_1^{U_i}, \quad U_{i+1} : \mathcal{O}_1^{V_i} \to \mathcal{O}_1^{V_{i+1}}, \quad 1 \le i \le s-1, \tag{102}$$

are minimal holomorphic maps between orbifolds.

A good chain $\mathcal{C}$ is called *non-negative* if

$$\chi(\mathcal{O}_2^{U_1}) \ge 0, \quad \chi(\mathcal{O}_2^{U_2}) \ge 0, \ \ldots \ , \chi(\mathcal{O}_2^{U_s}) \ge 0, \tag{103}$$

$$\chi(\mathcal{O}_2^{V_1}) \ge 0, \quad \chi(\mathcal{O}_2^{V_2}) \ge 0, \ \ldots \ , \chi(\mathcal{O}_2^{V_s}) \ge 0, \tag{104}$$

and *stable* if

$$\nu(\mathcal{O}_2^{U_1}) = \nu(\mathcal{O}_2^{U_2}) = \cdots = \nu(\mathcal{O}_2^{U_s}), \tag{105}$$

$$\nu(\mathcal{O}_2^{V_1}) = \nu(\mathcal{O}_2^{V_2}) = \cdots = \nu(\mathcal{O}_2^{V_s}). \tag{106}$$

For a stable chain $\mathcal{C}$ set

$$\chi_1(\mathcal{C}) = \chi(\mathcal{O}_2^{U_1}) = \chi(\mathcal{O}_2^{U_2}) = \cdots = \chi(\mathcal{O}_2^{U_s}),$$

$$\chi_2(\mathcal{C}) = \chi(\mathcal{O}_2^{V_1}) = \chi(\mathcal{O}_2^{V_2}) = \cdots = \chi(\mathcal{O}_2^{V_s}).$$

Notice that since (101) are minimal holomorphic maps, it follows from Proposition 2.2 that any stable chain is non-negative.

In this section we deduce from Theorem 6.4 a bound for lengths of stable chains satisfying $\chi_1(\mathcal{C}) > 0$, $\chi_2(\mathcal{C}) > 0$, whose basis is a non-special function. For brevity, set

$$Z_d = \frac{1}{2}\left(z^d + \frac{1}{z^d}\right).$$

Proposition 7.1. *Let F be a rational function, and $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}(s,d)$ a stable chain with the basis F such that $\chi_1(\mathcal{C}) > 0$, $\chi_2(\mathcal{C}) > 0$. Then either $F_i \underset{\mu}{\sim} z^d$, $1 \le i \le s$, or $F_i \underset{\mu}{\sim} T_d$, $1 \le i \le s$, or $F_i \underset{\mu}{\sim} Z_d$, $1 \le i \le s$, or $F_i \underset{\mu}{\sim} \Omega$, $1 \le i \le s$.*

Proof. For each i, $1 \le i \le s-1$, applying Theorem 6.4 to equality (98), we see that either $F_i \underset{\mu}{\sim} z^d$, or $F_i \underset{\mu}{\sim} T_d$, or $F_i \underset{\mu}{\sim} \Omega$, or $F_i \underset{\mu}{\sim} Z_d$. Thus, we only must prove that these possibilities cannot mix.

Assume that $F_i \underset{\mu}{\sim} Z_d$ for some i, $1 \le i \le s$. Since the functions z^d, T_d, Ω, Z_d are pairwise not μ-equivalent in view of the inequality $d = d_1 d_2 \ge 4$, it follows from Theorem 6.4 that there exist Möbius transformations α, β, μ_1, μ_2 such that either

$$U_i = \alpha \circ T_2 \circ \mu_1, \quad V_i = \mu_1^{-1} \circ \frac{1}{2}\left(z^{d_2/2} + \frac{1}{z^{d_2/2}}\right) \circ \beta,$$

or

$$U_i = \alpha \circ \frac{1}{2}\left(z^{d_1/2} + \frac{1}{z^{d_1/2}}\right) \circ \mu_1, \quad V_i = \mu_1^{-1} \circ z^2 \circ \beta.$$

In any case $\mathrm{GCD}(d_1, d_2) = 2$. Therefore, $F_i \underset{\mu}{\sim} Z_d$ for all i, $1 \le i \le s$, since any other possibility implies by Theorem 6.4 that d_1 and d_2 are coprime.

Assume now that $F_1 \underset{\mu}{\sim} z^d$. Then Theorem 6.4 implies that there exist Möbius transformations α, β, μ_1, μ_2 such that

$$U_1 = \alpha \circ z^{d_1} \circ \mu_1, \quad V_1 = \mu_1^{-1} \circ z^{d_2} \circ \beta, \quad V_2 = \alpha \circ z^{d_2} \circ \mu_2, \quad U_2 = \mu_2^{-1} \circ z^{d_1} \circ \beta, \tag{107}$$

where $\mathrm{GCD}(d_1, d_2) = 1$. Applying Theorem 6.4 to equality (98) for $i = 2$ and taking into account that $F_2 \underset{\mu}{\not\sim} Z_d$ since otherwise $F_1 \underset{\mu}{\sim} Z_d$, we conclude that there exist Möbius transformations $\widetilde{\alpha}$, $\widetilde{\beta}$ such that one of the following equalities holds

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_2^{-1} \circ z^{d_1} \circ \beta \circ \alpha \circ z^{d_2} \circ \mu_2 &= \widetilde{\alpha} \circ z^d \circ \widetilde{\beta}, \\ \mu_2^{-1} \circ z^{d_1} \circ \beta \circ \alpha \circ z^{d_2} \circ \mu_2 &= \widetilde{\alpha} \circ T_d \circ \widetilde{\beta}, \\ \mu_2^{-1} \circ z^{d_1} \circ \beta \circ \alpha \circ z^{d_2} \circ \mu_2 &= \widetilde{\alpha} \circ \Omega \circ \widetilde{\beta}. \end{aligned} \tag{108}$$

Since any decomposition of T_n is given by (31), if the second equality holds, then $z^{d_1} \underset{\mu}{\sim} T_{d_1}$ and $z^{d_2} \underset{\mu}{\sim} T_{d_2}$. However, this is impossible since $\mathrm{GCD}(d_1, d_2) = 1$ implies that at least one of the numbers d_1 and d_2 is greater than two. Further, taking into account that a unique decomposition of the number 12 into a product of two coprime numbers is $12 = 3 \times 4$, if the third equality holds, then by Corollary 3.7 there exist orbifolds $\mathcal{O}_1$ and $\mathcal{O}_2$ such that $\nu(\mathcal{O}_1) = \nu(\mathcal{O}_2) = \{2, 3, 6\}$ and $z^3 : \mathcal{O}_1 \to \mathcal{O}_2$ is a minimal holomorphic map between orbifolds. Since this contradicts to Corollary 5.2, we conclude that $F_2 = \widetilde{\alpha} \circ z^d \circ \widetilde{\beta}$.

Furthermore, continuing in the same way, we conclude that $F_i \underset{\mu}{\sim} z^d$ for all i, $1 \le i \le s$. Finally, it is clear how to modify the proof if instead of the condition $F_1 \underset{\mu}{\sim} z^d$ is given that $F_i \underset{\mu}{\sim} z^d$ for some i, $1 < i \le s$.

Similarly, if $F_1 \underset{\mu}{\sim} T_d$, then there exist Möbius transformations α, β, $\widetilde{\alpha}$, $\widetilde{\beta}$, μ_1, μ_2 such that

$$U_1 = \alpha \circ T_{d_1} \circ \mu_1, \quad V_1 = \mu_1^{-1} \circ T_{d_2} \circ \beta, \quad V_2 = \alpha \circ T_{d_2} \circ \mu_2, \quad U_2 = \mu_2^{-1} \circ T_{d_1} \circ \beta, \tag{109}$$

and one of the equalities

$$\mu_2^{-1} \circ T_{d_1} \circ \beta \circ \alpha \circ T_{d_2} \circ \mu_2 = \widetilde{\alpha} \circ T_d \circ \widetilde{\beta}, \tag{110}$$

$$\mu_2^{-1} \circ T_{d_1} \circ \beta \circ \alpha \circ T_{d_2} \circ \mu_2 = \widetilde{\alpha} \circ \Omega \circ \widetilde{\beta}$$

holds. Furthermore, the second equality is impossible since otherwise there exist orbifolds $\mathcal{O}_1$ and $\mathcal{O}_2$ such that $\nu(\mathcal{O}_1) = \nu(\mathcal{O}_2) = \{2, 3, 6\}$ and $T_4 : \mathcal{O}_1 \to \mathcal{O}_2$ is a minimal holomorphic map in contradiction with Corollary 5.2. Thus, $F_2 \underset{\mu}{\sim} T_d$ and continuing in the same way we conclude that $F_i \underset{\mu}{\sim} T_d$ for all i, $1 \leq i \leq s$. Again, it is clear how to modify the proof if instead of the condition $F_1 \underset{\mu}{\sim} T_d$ is given that $F_i \underset{\mu}{\sim} T_d$ for some i, $1 < i \leq s$.

Finally, if $F_i \underset{\mu}{\sim} \Omega$ for some i, $1 \leq i \leq s$, then $F_i \underset{\mu}{\sim} \Omega$ for all i, $1 \leq i \leq s$, since other possibilities are already excluded by the above analysis. □

Theorem 7.2. *Let F be a rational function, and $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}(s, d)$ a stable chain with the basis F such that $\chi_1(\mathcal{C}) > 0$, $\chi_2(\mathcal{C}) > 0$. Then $s < 4$, unless F is a special function.*

Proof. By Theorem 6.4, the function F_1 is μ-equivalent to one of the functions z^d, T_d, Ω, Z_d. We will consider all these cases one by one.

$\mathbf{F_1 \underset{\mu}{\sim} z^d}$. In this case, whenever $s \geq 3$, equalities (107) and (108) hold by Proposition 7.1, and it is easy to see that (108) implies the equality

$$(\beta \circ \alpha)\{0, \infty\} = \{0, \infty\}.$$

Thus, $\beta \circ \alpha = cz^{\pm 1}$, $c \in \mathbb{C}$, and therefore, the function $F_1 = U_1 \circ V_1 = \alpha \circ z^d \circ \beta$ is conjugated to $z^{\pm d}$, implying that $F = V_1 \circ U_1$ also is conjugated to $z^{\pm d}$ since any decomposition of z^n is given by (28).

$\mathbf{F_1 \underset{\mu}{\sim} T_d}$. Similarly, in this case equalities (109) and (110) hold. Assume first that $d_1 > 2$, $d_2 > 2$. Then the functions T_{d_1} and T_{d_2} have three critical values $-1, 1, \infty$. Therefore, since the right part of (110) also has three critical values, the chain rule implies that

$$(\beta \circ \alpha)\{-1, 1, \infty\} \subseteq T_{d_1}^{-1}\{-1, 1, \infty\}.$$

Clearly, $(\beta \circ \alpha)(\infty) = \infty$ since otherwise the left part of (110) does not have a critical point of the multiplicity $d = d_1 d_2$. Furthermore, $\beta \circ \alpha$ maps the set $\{-1, 1\}$ to itself since otherwise the left part of (110) would have a critical point of multiplicity 4. Thus, $\beta \circ \alpha = \pm z$ and hence $F_1 = U_1 \circ V_1 = \alpha \circ T_d \circ \beta$

is conjugated to $\pm T_d$, implying that F also is conjugated to $\pm T_d$, since any decomposition of T_n is given by (31).

If one of the numbers d_1, d_2 is equal two we must use along with the first two equalities in (98) also the third one, and the proof becomes more complicated. First observe that Theorem 6.4 and Proposition 7.1 imply that (up to a switch between d_1 and d_2) there exist Möbius transformations α, β, μ, $\widehat{\alpha}$, $\widehat{\beta}$, $\widehat{\mu}$, $\widetilde{\alpha}$, $\widetilde{\beta}$, ν, $\widetilde{\nu}$ such that

$$V_2 = \alpha \circ T_{d_2} \circ \mu, \quad U_2 = \mu^{-1} \circ T_{d_1} \circ \beta,$$
$$V_2 = \widehat{\mu}^{-1} \circ T_{d_2} \circ \widehat{\beta}, \quad U_2 = \widehat{\alpha} \circ T_{d_1} \circ \widehat{\mu}.$$

and

$$V_3 = \widehat{\alpha} \circ T_{d_2} \circ \nu, \quad U_3 = \nu^{-1} \circ T_{d_1} \circ \widehat{\beta},$$
$$V_3 = \widehat{\nu}^{-1} \circ T_{d_2} \circ \widetilde{\beta}, \quad U_3 = \widetilde{\alpha} \circ T_{d_1} \circ \widehat{\nu},$$

implying that

$$\alpha \circ T_d \circ \beta = \widehat{\mu}^{-1} \circ T_{d_2} \circ \widehat{\beta} \circ \widehat{\alpha} \circ T_{d_1} \circ \widehat{\mu} \tag{111}$$

and

$$\widetilde{\alpha} \circ T_d \circ \widetilde{\beta} = \nu^{-1} \circ T_{d_1} \circ \widehat{\beta} \circ \widehat{\alpha} \circ T_{d_2} \circ \nu. \tag{112}$$

Assume say that $d_1 = 2$. Then (111) implies that either $(\widehat{\beta} \circ \widehat{\alpha})(\infty) = \infty$ and $(\widehat{\beta} \circ \widehat{\alpha})(-1) \subseteq \{-1, 1\}$, or $(\widehat{\beta} \circ \widehat{\alpha})(-1) = \infty$ and $(\widehat{\beta} \circ \widehat{\alpha})(\infty) \subseteq \{-1, 1\}$. On the other hand, (112) implies that

$$(\widehat{\beta} \circ \widehat{\alpha})(-1) = -(\widehat{\beta} \circ \widehat{\alpha})(1), \tag{113}$$

and either $(\widehat{\beta} \circ \widehat{\alpha})(\infty) = \infty$, or $(\widehat{\beta} \circ \widehat{\alpha})(\infty) = 0$. These conditions yield that $\widehat{\beta} \circ \widehat{\alpha} = \pm z$ and hence

$$F_2 = U_2 \circ V_2 = \widehat{\alpha} \circ T_d \circ \widehat{\beta}$$

is conjugated to $\pm T_d$, implying that F also is conjugated to $\pm T_d$.

In the case $d_2 = 2$ we arrive to the same restrictions on $\widehat{\beta} \circ \widehat{\alpha}$ only in a different order. Thus, whenever $s \geq 4$, the condition $F_1 \underset{\mu}{\sim} T_d$ implies that F is conjugated to $\pm T_d$.

$\mathbf{F_1} \underset{\mu}{\sim} \mathbf{\Omega}$. In this case we conclude as above that there exist Möbius transformations α, β, μ, and $\widehat{\alpha}$, $\widehat{\beta}$, $\widehat{\mu}$ such that (possibly with Γ and Δ switched)

$$V_2 = \alpha \circ \Delta \circ \mu, \quad U_2 = \mu^{-1} \circ \Gamma \circ \beta,$$
$$V_2 = \widehat{\mu}^{-1} \circ \Delta \circ \widehat{\beta}, \quad U_2 = \widehat{\alpha} \circ \Gamma \circ \widehat{\mu}.$$

and

$$V_3 = \widehat{\alpha} \circ \Delta \circ \nu, \quad U_3 = \nu^{-1} \circ \Gamma \circ \widehat{\beta},$$
$$V_3 = \widehat{\nu}^{-1} \circ \Delta \circ \widetilde{\beta}, \quad U_3 = \widetilde{\alpha} \circ \Gamma \circ \widehat{\nu},$$

implying that

$$\alpha \circ \Omega \circ \beta = \widehat{\mu}^{-1} \circ \Delta \circ \widehat{\beta} \circ \widehat{\alpha} \circ \Gamma \circ \widehat{\mu} \tag{114}$$

and

$$\widetilde{\alpha}\circ\Omega\circ\widetilde{\beta}=\nu^{-1}\circ\Gamma\circ\widehat{\beta}\circ\widehat{\alpha}\circ\Delta\circ\nu. \tag{115}$$

Further, in view of formulas (80), (81), (89), (88), and (91), it follows easily from (114) that either

$$(\widehat{\beta}\circ\widehat{\alpha})(1)=1,\quad (\widehat{\beta}\circ\widehat{\alpha})\{0,\infty\}=\{0,\infty\},$$

or

$$(\widehat{\beta}\circ\widehat{\alpha})(1)=0,\quad (\widehat{\beta}\circ\widehat{\alpha})\{0,\infty\}=\{1,-1/8\}.$$

On the other hand, (115) implies that either

$$(\widehat{\beta}\circ\widehat{\alpha})(\infty)=\infty,\quad (\widehat{\beta}\circ\widehat{\alpha})\{0,1\}=\{0,1\},$$

or

$$(\widehat{\beta}\circ\widehat{\alpha})(\infty)=0,\quad (\widehat{\beta}\circ\widehat{\alpha})\{0,1\}=\{\infty,-1/8\}.$$

Since these conditions imply that $\widehat{\beta}\circ\widehat{\alpha}=z$, we conclude that

$$F_2=U_2\circ V_2=\widehat{\alpha}\circ\Omega\circ\widehat{\beta}$$

is conjugated to Ω, implying that F also is conjugated to Ω.

Switching between Γ and Δ we obtain the equalities

$$V_2=\alpha\circ\Gamma\circ\mu,\quad U_2=\mu^{-1}\circ\Delta\circ\beta,$$

$$V_2=\widehat{\mu}^{-1}\circ\Gamma\circ\widehat{\beta},\quad U_2=\widehat{\alpha}\circ\Delta\circ\widehat{\mu}.$$

and

$$V_3=\widehat{\alpha}\circ\Gamma\circ\nu,\quad U_3=\nu^{-1}\circ\Delta\circ\widehat{\beta},$$

$$V_3=\widehat{\nu}^{-1}\circ\Gamma\circ\widetilde{\beta},\quad U_3=\widetilde{\alpha}\circ\Delta\circ\widehat{\nu},$$

which imply the equalities

$$\alpha\circ\Omega\circ\beta=\widehat{\mu}^{-1}\circ\Gamma\circ\widehat{\beta}\circ\widehat{\alpha}\circ\Delta\circ\widehat{\mu}$$

and

$$\widetilde{\alpha}\circ\Omega\circ\widetilde{\beta}=\nu^{-1}\circ\Delta\circ\widehat{\beta}\circ\widehat{\alpha}\circ\Gamma\circ\nu,$$

having the same consequences as (114), (115).

$\mathbf{F_1}\underset{\mu}{\sim}\mathbf{Z_d}$. Assume first that $d\geq 6$. If $d_1>d_2=2$, then there exist Möbius transformations α, β, μ, and $\widehat{\alpha}$, $\widehat{\beta}$, $\widehat{\mu}$ such that

$$V_2=\alpha\circ T_2\circ\mu,\quad U_2=\mu^{-1}\circ Z_{d/2}\circ\beta, \tag{116}$$

$$V_2=\widehat{\mu}^{-1}\circ z^2\circ\widehat{\beta},\quad U_2=\widehat{\alpha}\circ Z_{d/2}\circ\widehat{\mu}. \tag{117}$$

and

$$V_3=\widehat{\alpha}\circ T_2\circ\nu,\quad U_3=\nu^{-1}\circ Z_{d/2}\circ\widehat{\beta}, \tag{118}$$

$$V_3 = \widehat{\nu}^{-1} \circ z^2 \circ \widetilde{\beta}, \quad U_3 = \widetilde{\alpha} \circ Z_{d/2} \circ \widehat{\nu}, \tag{119}$$

implying that

$$\alpha \circ Z_d \circ \beta = \widehat{\mu}^{-1} \circ z^2 \circ \widehat{\beta} \circ \widehat{\alpha} \circ Z_{d/2} \circ \widehat{\mu} \tag{120}$$

and

$$\widetilde{\alpha} \circ Z_d \circ \widetilde{\beta} = \nu^{-1} \circ Z_{d/2} \circ \widehat{\beta} \circ \widehat{\alpha} \circ T_2 \circ \nu. \tag{121}$$

Since $d/2 \geq 3$ the analysis of the branchings of the parts of (120) implies that $(\widehat{\beta} \circ \widehat{\alpha})(\infty) \subset \{0, \infty\}$ and equality (113) holds. On the other hand, (121) implies that

$$(\widehat{\beta} \circ \widehat{\alpha})\{-1, \infty\} = \{0, \infty\}. \tag{122}$$

It is easy to see however that these conditions cannot be true simultaneously.

Similarly, still assuming that $d \geq 6$, but $d_1 > d_2 = 2$ we arrive to the equalities

$$V_2 = \alpha \circ Z_{d/2} \circ \mu, \quad U_2 = \mu^{-1} \circ z^2 \circ \beta, \tag{123}$$

$$V_2 = \widehat{\mu}^{-1} \circ Z_{d/2} \circ \widehat{\beta}, \quad U_2 = \widehat{\alpha} \circ T_2 \circ \widehat{\mu}. \tag{124}$$

and

$$V_3 = \widehat{\alpha} \circ Z_{d/2} \circ \nu, \quad U_3 = \nu^{-1} \circ z^2 \circ \widehat{\beta}, \tag{125}$$

$$V_3 = \widehat{\nu}^{-1} \circ Z_{d/2} \circ \widetilde{\beta}, \quad U_3 = \widetilde{\alpha} \circ T_2 \circ \widehat{\nu}, \tag{126}$$

which imply the equalities

$$\alpha \circ Z_d \circ \beta = \widehat{\mu}^{-1} \circ Z_{d/2} \circ \widehat{\beta} \circ \widehat{\alpha} \circ T_2 \circ \widehat{\mu}$$

and

$$\widetilde{\alpha} \circ Z_d \circ \widetilde{\beta} = \nu^{-1} \circ z^2 \circ \widehat{\beta} \circ \widehat{\alpha} \circ Z_{d/2} \circ \nu.$$

having the same consequences as (120) and (121). Thus, there exist no chains of length three with the basis μ-equivalent to Z_d, $d \geq 6$.

Consider now the case where $d = 4$. In this case the proof is distinct in two aspects. First, in this case (120) implies equality (113) only, while equality (121) implies, instead of equality (122), the equality

$$Z_1\left((\widehat{\beta} \circ \widehat{\alpha})(-1)\right) = Z_1\left((\widehat{\beta} \circ \widehat{\alpha})(\infty)\right). \tag{127}$$

Equalities (113) and (127) may hold simultaneously. However, a direct calculation shows that this happens if and only if

$$\widehat{\beta} \circ \widehat{\alpha} = \frac{1}{c} \frac{1 - c^2 z}{z - c^2}, \quad c \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0, 1, -1\}.$$

This implies that the function

$$f = Z_{d/2} \circ \widehat{\beta} \circ \widehat{\alpha} \circ T_2 = \widehat{\mu} \circ V_2 \circ U_2 \circ \widehat{\mu}^{-1}$$

has three critical values $-1, 1, -\frac{1}{2}(c + \frac{1}{c})$, and

$$f^{-1}\left(\frac{1}{2}\left(c+\frac{1}{c}\right)\right)=\left\{\frac{1}{2}\left(c+\frac{1}{c}\right),-\frac{1}{2}\left(c+\frac{1}{c}\right),-1,1\right\}.$$

Thus, for the orbifold $\mathcal{O}$ defined by the equalities

$$\nu\left(\frac{1}{2}\left(c+\frac{1}{c}\right)\right)=\nu\left(-\frac{1}{2}\left(c+\frac{1}{c}\right)\right)=\nu(-1)=\nu(1)=2,$$

$f:\mathcal{O}\to\mathcal{O}$ is a covering map between orbifolds. Hence f is a Lattès function implying that F also is a Lattès function.

Another distinction is that for $d=4$ Theorem 6.4 admits in addition to (116), (117), (118), (119) and (123), (124), (125), (126) also other possibilities. Say, equality (116) may be followed by equality (124) instead of equality (117). More precisely, we must consider the following combinations:

- (116), (117), (118), (126)
- (116), (124), (125), (126)
- (116), (124), (125), (119)
- (123), (124), (125), (119)
- (123), (117), (118), (119)
- (123), (117), (118), (126)

However, they all lead again to a pair of equalities of type (120) and (121). □

8 Good chains

For a chain $\mathcal{C}$ given by (98) define its *subchain* as any chain of the form

$$U_i\circ V_i=V_{i+1}\circ U_{i+1},\quad i_1\le i\le i_2-1, \tag{128}$$

where $1\le i_1<i_2\le s$. We will denote subchain (128) by $\mathcal{C}_{i_1,i_2}$. Thus, $\mathcal{C}=\mathcal{C}_{1,s}$, and the length of $\mathcal{C}_{i_1,i_2}$ equals i_2-i_1+1.

In this section we prove the finiteness of any good chain whose basis is not a special function (Theorem 8.6). We use the following strategy. First, using a modification of a result from the paper [14] (Proposition 8.1) we show that any good chain whose length is big enough contains a non-negative subchain of any desired length (Proposition 8.3). Then we prove a similar result for non-negative chains and their stable subchains (Proposition 8.4). Finally, we prove the finiteness of stable chains (Theorem 8.5) in the case which is not covered by Theorem 7.2.

Proposition 8.1. *Let g be a rational functions and $\mathcal{O}_1$ and $\mathcal{O}_2$ orbifolds such that $g:\mathcal{O}_1\to\mathcal{O}_2$ is a holomorphic map between orbifolds. Assume that there exists a rational function f such that $\mathcal{O}_1=\mathcal{O}_2^f$, and the numbers $m=\deg g$ and $n=\deg f$ satisfy the inequality $m\ge 84(n-2)$. Then $\chi(\mathcal{O}_2)\ge 0$.*

Proof. Assume that $\chi(\mathcal{O}_2) < 0$. Then in fact

$$\chi(\mathcal{O}_2) \leq -\frac{1}{42}, \tag{129}$$

since for any orbifold $\mathcal{O}$ the inequality $\chi(\mathcal{O}) < 0$ implies inequality (27). On the other hand, by Proposition 2.2,

$$\chi(\mathcal{O}_2) \geq \frac{\chi(\mathcal{O}_2^f)}{m}.$$

Furthermore, it follows from the definition that

$$\chi(\mathcal{O}_2^f) > 2 - e_f,$$

where e_f denotes the number of critical values of f. Since this number is less than or equal to the number of points $z \in \mathbb{CP}^1$ where $\deg_z f > 1$, the Riemann-Hurwitz formula (53) implies that

$$e_f \leq 2n - 2.$$

Thus,

$$\chi(\mathcal{O}_2^f) > 4 - 2n,$$

and hence

$$\chi(\mathcal{O}_2) > \frac{4-2n}{m} \geq -\frac{1}{42}.$$

The contradiction obtained proves the proposition. □

For integer $d \geq 4$ set

$$\theta(d) = \begin{cases} \log_2 84(d-4), & \text{if } d > 4 \\ 1, & \text{if } d = 4. \end{cases} \tag{130}$$

Lemma 8.2. *Let $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}(s,d)$ be a good chain. Assume that $s \geq \theta(d)$. Then*

$$\chi(\mathcal{O}_2^{U_1}) \geq 0, \quad \chi(\mathcal{O}_2^{V_s}) \geq 0. \tag{131}$$

Proof. Since maps (101) are minimal holomorphic maps between orbifolds, it follows from Corollary 2.4 that

$$V_{2,s} : \mathcal{O}_2^{U_s} \to \mathcal{O}_2^{U_1}$$

also is a minimal holomorphic map. Thus, by Proposition 8.1, in order to prove that $\chi(\mathcal{O}_2^{U_1}) \geq 0$ it is enough to show that

$$\deg V_{2,s} \geq 84(\deg U_1 - 2). \tag{132}$$

Clearly, the inequality $s \geq \theta(d)$ implies the inequality

$$2^{s-1} \geq 84(d/2 - 2). \tag{133}$$

On the other hand, since $\deg V_i \geq 2$, $1 \leq i \leq s$, and $\deg U_1 \leq d/2$, the inequalities

$$\deg V_{2,s} \geq 2^{s-1}, \quad 84(d/2-2) \geq 84(\deg U_1 - 2) \tag{134}$$

hold. Finally, (133) and (134) imply (132).

The inequality $\chi(\mathcal{O}_2^{V_s}) \geq 0$ follows in a similar way from the fact that

$$U_{1,s-1} : \mathcal{O}_2^{V_1} \to \mathcal{O}_2^{V_s}$$

is a covering map. □

Notice that if $d = 4$ the statement of the lemma is trivial since in this case $\deg U_1 = \deg V_s = 2$, and it is easy to see that for any rational function f of degree 2 we have $\chi(\mathcal{O}_2^f) = 1$ since $\nu(\mathcal{O}_2^f) = \{2, 2\}$.

Proposition 8.3. *Let $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}(s, d)$ be a good chain such that $s \geq 2\theta(d) + k - 2$, where $k \geq 2$. Then $\mathcal{C}$ contains a non-negative subchain of length k.*

Proof. Applying Lemma 8.2 to the subchains $\mathcal{C}_{1+i,s}$ and $\mathcal{C}_{1,s-i}$ for i, $0 \leq i \leq k$, we conclude that if $s \geq \theta(d)+k$, $k \geq 0$, then for any i, $0 \leq i \leq k$, the inequalities

$$\chi(\mathcal{O}_2^{U_{1+i}}) \geq 0, \quad \chi(\mathcal{O}_2^{V_{s-i}}) \geq 0 \tag{135}$$

hold. Furthermore, if $s \geq 2\theta(d) + k - 2$, then

$$\chi(\mathcal{O}_2^{U_{1+i}}) \geq 0, \quad 0 \leq i \leq \theta(d) + k - 2$$

and

$$\chi(\mathcal{O}_2^{V_{s-i}}) \geq 0, \quad 0 \leq i \leq \theta(d) + k - 2.$$

Therefore,

$$\chi(\mathcal{O}_2^{U_j}) \geq 0, \quad \chi(\mathcal{O}_2^{V_j}) \geq 0, \quad \theta(d) \leq j \leq \theta(d) + k - 2,$$

implying that the chain $\mathcal{C}_{\theta(d),\theta(d)+k-1}$ is non-negative. □

Proposition 8.4. *Let $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}(s, d)$ be a non-negative chain. Then $\mathcal{C}$ contains a stable subchain of length $\lceil s/7 \rceil$.*

Proof. Let $1 = i_1 \leq i_2 \leq \cdots \leq i_l \leq s$ be indices such that

$$\begin{gathered}
\nu(\mathcal{O}_2^{U_1}) = \nu(\mathcal{O}_2^{U_2}) = \cdots = \nu(\mathcal{O}_2^{U_{i_2-1}}), \\
\nu(\mathcal{O}_2^{U_{i_2}}) = \nu(\mathcal{O}_2^{U_{i_2+1}}) = \cdots = \nu(\mathcal{O}_2^{U_{i_3-1}}), \\
\cdots \\
\nu(\mathcal{O}_2^{U_{i_l}}) = \nu(\mathcal{O}_2^{U_{i_l+1}}) = \cdots = \nu(\mathcal{O}_2^{U_s}),
\end{gathered} \tag{136}$$

and

$$\nu(\mathcal{O}_2^{U_1}) \neq \nu(\mathcal{O}_2^{U_{i_2}}), \quad \nu(\mathcal{O}_2^{U_{i_2}}) \neq \nu(\mathcal{O}_2^{U_{i_3}}), \quad \ldots \quad \nu(\mathcal{O}_2^{U_{i_{l-1}}}) \neq \nu(\mathcal{O}_2^{U_{i_l}}).$$

Since

$$V_{i+1} : \mathcal{O}_2^{U_{i+1}} \to \mathcal{O}_2^{U_i}, \quad 1 \le i \le s-1, \tag{137}$$

are minimal holomorphic maps between orbifolds, we have:

$$\nu(\mathcal{O}_2^{U_{i_l}}) \le \cdots \le \nu(\mathcal{O}_2^{U_{i_2}}) \le \nu(\mathcal{O}_2^{U_1}). \tag{138}$$

Show first that $l \le 4$.

If $\chi(\mathcal{O}_2^{U_1}) = 0$, then applying Proposition 2.2 to the sequence of maps (137), and using the non-negativity of $\mathcal{C}$, we see that

$$\chi(\mathcal{O}_2^{U_1}) = \chi(\mathcal{O}_2^{U_2}) = \cdots = \chi(\mathcal{O}_2^{U_s}) = 0, \tag{139}$$

and all maps (137) in fact are covering maps between orbifolds. It follows now from Table 1 that $l \le 2$. Furthermore, if $\chi(\mathcal{O}_2^{U_1}) > 0$ but $\chi(\mathcal{O}_2^{U_{i_2}}) = 0$, then modifying the reasoning above, we conclude that $l \le 3$. So, assume that $\chi(\mathcal{O}_2^{U_1}) > 0$ and $\chi(\mathcal{O}_2^{U_{i_2}}) > 0$.

If $U_1 \underset{\mu}{\sim} z^n$, $n \ge 2$, or $U_1 \underset{\mu}{\sim} \frac{1}{2}\left(z^n + z^{-n}\right)$, $n \ge 2$, then applying Corollary 3.5 consequently to equalities (98), we see that

$$\nu(\mathcal{O}_2^{U_i}) = \nu(\mathcal{O}_2^{U_1}), \quad 1 \le i \le s,$$

implying that $l = 1$. On the other hand, if $U_1 \underset{\mu}{\sim} T_n$, and $l > 1$, then Corollary 3.5 implies that either $U_{i_2} \underset{\mu}{\sim} z^n$, $n \ge 2$, or $U_{i_2} \underset{\mu}{\sim} \frac{1}{2}\left(z^{n/2} + z^{-n/2}\right)$, $n \ge 2$. Thus,

$$\nu(\mathcal{O}_2^{U_i}) = \nu(\mathcal{O}_2^{U_{i_2}}), \quad i_2 \le i \le s, \tag{140}$$

and hence $l \le 2$. This proves the lemma in the cases $\nu(\mathcal{O}_2^{U_1}) = \{n, n\}$, $n \ge 2$, and $\nu(\mathcal{O}_2^{U_1}) = \{2, 2, n\}$, $n \ge 2$.

If $\nu(\mathcal{O}_2^{U_1}) = \{2, 3, 3\}$, and $l > 1$, then it follows from (138) by the non-negativity of $\mathcal{C}$ that either $\nu(\mathcal{O}_2^{U_{i_2}}) = \{n, n\}$, $2 \le n \le 3$, or $\nu(\mathcal{O}_2^{U_{i_2}}) = \{2, 2, n\}$, $2 \le n \le 3$. Moreover, by formulas (37), (38), the degree of U_1 is 12, 6, or 4. Therefore, $U_{i_2} \underset{\mu}{\not\sim} T_m$, since otherwise the equality $\deg U_1 = \deg U_{i_2}$ implies that $\nu(\mathcal{O}_2^{U_{i_2}}) = (2, 2, m)$, where m equals 12, 6, or 4, in contradiction with $\nu(\mathcal{O}_2^{U_{i_2}}) \le \nu(\mathcal{O}_2^{U_1})$. Thus, either $U_{i_2} \underset{\mu}{\sim} \frac{1}{2}\left(z^n + z^{-n}\right)$, $2 \le n \le 3$, or $U_{i_2} \underset{\mu}{\sim} z^n$, $2 \le n \le 3$, implying that (140) holds. Thus, again, $l \le 2$.

Finally, if $\nu(\mathcal{O}_2^{U_1}) = (2, 3, 4)$ or $\nu(\mathcal{O}_2^{U_1}) = \{2, 3, 5\}$, and $l > 1$, then (138) implies that either $\nu(\mathcal{O}_2^{U_{i_2}}) = \{2, 3, 3\}$, or $\nu(\mathcal{O}_2^{U_{i_2}}) = \{n, n\}$, $2 \le n \le 4$, or $\nu(\mathcal{O}_2^{U_{i_2}}) = \{2, 2, n\}$, $2 \le n \le 4$, and the results proved above imply that $l \le 4$.

Similarly, applying Corollary 3.5 to the sequence of minimal holomorphic maps between orbifolds

$$U_i : \mathcal{O}_2^{V_i} \to \mathcal{O}_2^{V_{i+1}}, \quad 1 \le i \le s-1,$$

(starting this time from $i = s+1$), we can find e, $1 \le e \le 4$, and indices $j_1, \dots, j_e$ such that $1 = j_1 \le j_2 \le \cdots \le j_e \le s$ and

$$\begin{gathered}\nu(\mathcal{O}_2^{V_1}) = \nu(\mathcal{O}_2^{V_2}) = \cdots = \nu(\mathcal{O}_2^{V_{j_2-1}}),\\ \nu(\mathcal{O}_2^{V_{j_2}}) = \nu(\mathcal{O}_2^{V_{j_2+1}}) = \cdots = \nu(\mathcal{O}_2^{V_{j_3-1}}),\\ \cdots\\ \nu(\mathcal{O}_2^{V_{j_e}}) = \nu(\mathcal{O}_2^{V_{j_l+1}}) = \cdots = \nu(\mathcal{O}_2^{V_s}).\end{gathered} \tag{141}$$

It follows now easily from (136), (141), and the equalities $l \le 4$, $e \le 4$ that $\mathcal{C}$ contains a stable subchain of length $\lceil s/7 \rceil$. □

Theorem 8.5. *Let F be a rational function, and $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}(s,d)$ a stable chain with the basis F. Assume that either $\chi_1(\mathcal{C}) = 0$ or $\chi_2(\mathcal{C}) = 0$. Then $s < 5$, unless F is a Lattès function.*

Proof. Assume that $\chi_1(\mathcal{C}) = 0$ and $s \ge 5$. Since $\chi_1(\mathcal{C}) = 0$ implies that all maps (137) are covering maps between orbifolds, it follows from Corollary 2.4 that

$$V_{2,j} : \mathcal{O}_2^{U_j} \to \mathcal{O}_2^{U_1}, \quad 2 \le j \le s,$$

are covering maps. Since $\deg V_{2,4} \ge 2^3 = 8$, the fact that $V_{2,4} : \mathcal{O}_2^{U_4} \to \mathcal{O}_2^{U_2}$ is a covering map implies by Corollary 5.3 the equality

$$\mathcal{O}_2^{V_{2,4}} = \mathcal{O}_2^{U_1}. \tag{142}$$

Similarly, since

$$V_i : \mathcal{O}_1^{U_{i+1}} \to \mathcal{O}_1^{U_i}, \quad 1 \le i \le s-1,$$

also are covering maps between orbifolds, we see that

$$V_{2,j} : \mathcal{O}_1^{U_{j+1}} \to \mathcal{O}_1^{U_2}, \quad 2 \le j \le s-1,$$

are covering maps, implying in the same way as above that

$$\mathcal{O}_2^{V_{2,4}} = \mathcal{O}_1^{U_2}. \tag{143}$$

Clearly, (142) and (143) imply that

$$\mathcal{O}_1^{U_2} = \mathcal{O}_2^{U_1}.$$

On the other hand, since

$$V_1 : \mathcal{O}_1^{U_2} \to \mathcal{O}_1^{U_1}, \quad U_1 : \mathcal{O}_1^{U_1} \to \mathcal{O}_2^{U_2}$$

are covering maps,

$$U_1 \circ V_1 : \mathcal{O}_1^{U_2} \to \mathcal{O}_2^{U_1}$$

also is a covering map by Corollary 2.4. Thus, (143) implies that $U_1 \circ V_1$ is a Lattès function. Therefore, by Corollary 3.8, the function $F = V_1 \circ U_1 \sim U_1 \circ V_1$ also is a Lattès function.

Similarly, if $\chi_2(\mathcal{C}) = 0$ and $s \geq 5$, then considering the sequence of covering maps between orbifolds

$$U_i : \mathcal{O}_2^{V_i} \to \mathcal{O}_2^{V_{i+1}}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq s-1,$$

corresponding to the dual chain, and arguing as above we conclude that

$$U_{2,s-1} : \mathcal{O}_2^{V_2} \to \mathcal{O}_2^{V_s}, \quad U_{2,s-1} : \mathcal{O}_1^{V_1} \to \mathcal{O}_1^{V_{s-1}}$$

are covering maps and

$$\mathcal{O}_1^{V_{s-1}} = \mathcal{O}_2^{V_s},$$

implying that F is a Lattès function since

$$V_s \circ U_s : \mathcal{O}_1^{V_{s-1}} \to \mathcal{O}_2^{V_s}$$

is a covering map and $F \sim V_s \circ U_s$. □

Theorem 8.6. *Let F be a rational function, and $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}(s, d)$ a good chain with the basis F. Then $s \leq 2\theta(d) + 26$, unless F is a special function.*

Proof. If $s \geq 2\theta(d) + 27$, then by Proposition 8.3 the chain $\mathcal{C}$ contains a non-negative subchain $\widehat{\mathcal{C}}$ of length 29, and applying Proposition 8.4 to $\widehat{\mathcal{C}}$ we conclude that $\mathcal{C}$ contains a stable subchain $\widetilde{\mathcal{C}}$ of length 5. Further, by Theorem 8.5 and Theorem 7.2, the basis $\widetilde{F}$ of $\widetilde{\mathcal{C}}$ is a special function. If $\widetilde{F}$ is conjugated to $z^{\pm d}$, then the basis F of $\mathcal{C}$ also is conjugated to $z^{\pm d}$ since $\widetilde{F} \sim F$ and any decomposition of the function $z^{\pm d}$ is given by formulas (28). Similarly, if $\widetilde{F}$ is conjugated to $\pm T_d$, then F also is conjugated to $\pm T_d$ since any decomposition of the function $\pm T_d$ is given by formulas (31). Finally, if $\widetilde{F}$ is a Lattès function, then F is a Lattès function by Corollary 3.8. □

9 Primitive solutions of $A \circ X = X \circ B$

For a rational function B define $\mathcal{E}(B)$ as the set of all rational functions X of degree at least two such that (3) holds for some rational function A. Notice that for any $X \in \mathcal{E}(B)$ the corresponding function A is defined in a unique way, since the equalities $A_1 \circ X = X \circ B$ and $A_2 \circ X = X \circ B$ imply the equality $A_1 \circ X = A_2 \circ X$ which in its turn implies the equality $A_1 = A_2$. In the next two sections we provide a structural description of the set $\mathcal{E}(B)$ for non-special B and prove Theorems 1.1-1.3.

Following [13], we will call a solution A, X, B of equation (3) *primitive* if $\mathbb{C}(X, B) = \mathbb{C}(z)$. By Lemma 2.6, a solution A, X, B is primitive if and only if the corresponding solution

$$A = A, \quad C = X, \quad D = X, \quad B = B$$

of (13) is good. The subset of $\mathcal{E}(B)$ consisting of functions X such that $\mathbb{C}(X, B) = \mathbb{C}(z)$ will be denoted by $\mathcal{E}_0(B)$.

For a rational function B define $\mathcal{G}(B)$ as a collection of Möbius transformations μ such that

$$B \circ \mu = \nu_\mu \circ B \tag{144}$$

for some Möbius transformations ν_μ. It is easy to see that in fact $\mathcal{G}(B)$ is a group with respect to the composition operation, and the map $\mu \to \nu_\mu$ is a homomorphism from $\mathcal{G}(B)$ to $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{CP}^1)$. For example, for $B = z^d$ the definition implies easily that $\mathcal{G}(B)$ consists of the transformations $\mu = \alpha z^{\pm 1}$, $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$. This situation is however exceptional as the following statement shows.

Proposition 9.1. *Let B be a rational function of degree $d \geq 2$ such that $B \underset{\mu}{\not\sim} z^d$. Then the group $\mathcal{G}(B)$ is a finite and, if $\mathcal{G}(B)$ is C_n or D_{2n}, the inequality $n < d$ holds. Furthermore, if B is a polynomial, then $\mathcal{G}(B)$ is cyclic.*

Proof. Since any non-identical element of $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{CP}^1) = \mathrm{PSL}_2(\mathbb{C})$ is conjugated either to $z \to z + 1$ or to $z \to \lambda z$, for some $\lambda \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0, 1\}$, making the change

$$B \to \mu_1 \circ B \circ \mu_2, \quad \mu \to \mu_2 \circ \mu \circ \mu_2^{-1}, \quad \nu_\mu \to \mu_1 \circ \nu_\mu \circ \mu_1^{-1} \tag{145}$$

for convenient Möbius transformations μ_1, μ_2, without loss of generality we may assume that μ and ν_μ in (144) have one of the two forms above.

Further, since any of the equalities

$$B(z + 1) = \lambda B(z), \quad \lambda \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0, 1\},$$

or

$$B(z + 1) = B(z) + 1$$

implies that $B(z)$ has infinitely many poles, they are impossible. On the other hand, considering constant terms in the Laurent series at infinity of both parts of

$$B(\lambda z) = B(z) + 1, \tag{146}$$

$\lambda \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0, 1\}$, we conclude that this equality is impossible either. Thus, $B(\lambda_1 z) = \lambda_2 B(z)$, where $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0, 1\}$. Considering now Laurent series of both parts of this equality and taking into account that $B \underset{\mu}{\not\sim} z^d$, we conclude that λ_1 is a root of unity and $B = z^r R(z^n)$, where $R \in \mathbb{C}(z)$, $r \geq 0$, and $n = \mathrm{ord}(\lambda_1)$. In particular, this implies that for any element σ of the group $\mathcal{G}(B)$ the inequality $\mathrm{ord}(\sigma) < d$ holds.

Let now $\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \ldots, \sigma_s, \ldots$ be a sequence of elements of $\mathcal{G}(B)$. Then for any $s \geq 1$ the group

$$\Gamma_s = < \sigma_1, \sigma_2, \ldots, \sigma_s >$$

is finite. Indeed, if Γ_s is infinite, then the lifting $\overline{\Gamma_s}$ of Γ_s to $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{C})$ also is infinite. Since by the Schur Theorem (see e.g. [1], (36.2)) any infinite finitely generated subgroup of $\mathrm{GL_k}(\mathbb{C})$ has an element of infinite order $\overline{\sigma}$, we conclude that if Γ_s is infinite, then $\Gamma_s \subseteq \mathcal{G}(B)$ has an element σ of infinite order in contradiction with $\mathrm{ord}(\sigma) < d$.

Further, if $|\Gamma_s| \to \infty$, then since

$$|\Gamma_1| \le |\Gamma_2| \le \cdots \le |\Gamma_s| \le \dots$$

and the groups Γ_s, $s \ge 1$, are finite rotation groups, for s big enough the group Γ_s is either C_n or D_{2n} with $n > d$, implying that $\mathcal{G}(B)$ has an element σ such that $\operatorname{ord}(\sigma) > d$. Therefore, there exists s_0 such that for $s \ge s_0$ the equality $|\Gamma_s| = |\Gamma_{s_0}|$ holds, and hence $\mathcal{G}(B) = \Gamma_{s_0}$ is a finite rotation group. Finally, it is clear that if $\mathcal{G}(B)$ is A_4, S_4, or A_5, then $\mathcal{G}(B) \le 60$, while if $\mathcal{G}(B)$ is C_n or D_{2n}, then $n < d$, since C_n and D_{2n} have an element of order n.

If B is a polynomial, then it follows from (144) taking into account the condition $B \underset{\mu}{\not\sim} z^d$ that ν_μ and μ are polynomials. Further, after a convenient change (145), we may assume that B is monic and the coefficient of z^{d-1} is zero, and it is easy to see that for such B the group $\mathcal{G}(B)$ consists of the transformations $z \to \varepsilon z$, $\varepsilon^n = 1$, where n is the greatest number such that $B = z^r R(z^n)$ for some $R \in \mathbb{C}[z]$ and $r \ge 0$. □

For orbifolds $\mathcal{O}_1, \mathcal{O}_2, \dots, \mathcal{O}_s$ define an orbifold $\mathcal{O} = \operatorname{LCM}(\mathcal{O}_1, \mathcal{O}_2, \dots, \mathcal{O}_s)$ by the condition

$$\nu(z) = \operatorname{LCM}\Big(\nu_1(z), \nu_2(z), \dots, \nu_s(z)\Big), \quad z \in \mathbb{CP}^1.$$

Lemma 9.2. *Let $\mathcal{O}_1, \mathcal{O}_2, \dots, \mathcal{O}_s$ and $\mathcal{O}'_1, \mathcal{O}'_2, \dots, \mathcal{O}'_s$ be orbifolds, and B a rational function such that $B : \mathcal{O}_i \to \mathcal{O}'_i$, $1 \le i \le s$, are holomorphic maps between orbifolds. Then*

$$B : \operatorname{LCM}(\mathcal{O}_1, \mathcal{O}_2, \dots, \mathcal{O}_s) \to \operatorname{LCM}(\mathcal{O}'_1, \mathcal{O}'_2, \dots, \mathcal{O}'_s)$$

also is a holomorphic map between orbifolds.

Proof. Indeed, the equalities

$$\nu'_i(f(z)) \mid \nu_i(z) \deg_z f, \quad 1 \le i \le s,$$

imply that

$$\operatorname{LCM}\Big(\nu'_1(f(z)), \nu'_2(f(z)), \dots, \nu'_s(f(z))\Big) \mid$$

$$\operatorname{LCM}\Big(\nu_1(z)\deg_z f,\, \nu_2(z)\deg_z f,\, \dots, \nu_s(z)\deg_z f\Big) =$$

$$\operatorname{LCM}\Big(\nu_1(z), \nu_2(z), \dots, \nu_s(z)\Big)\deg_z f. \qquad \square$$

Theorem 9.3. *Let B be a non-special rational function of degree $d \ge 2$. Then for any $X \in \mathcal{E}_0(B)$ the inequalities $\chi(\mathcal{O}_2^X) > 0$ and $\deg X \le \max\{60, 2d-1\}$ hold. Furthermore, up to the change $X \to \mu \circ X$, where μ is a Möbius transformation, the set $\mathcal{E}_0(B)$ is finite.*

Proof. Let X be an element of $\mathcal{E}_0(B)$ and A the corresponding function such that (3) holds. Since A, B, and X form a good solution of (13), the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{O}_1^X & \xrightarrow{B} & \mathcal{O}_1^X \\ \big\downarrow X & & \big\downarrow X \\ \mathcal{O}_2^X & \xrightarrow{A} & \mathcal{O}_2^X \end{array} \tag{147}$$

consists of minimal holomorphic maps between orbifolds. Therefore, applying Proposition 2.2 to the holomorphic map

$$A : \mathcal{O}_2^X \to \mathcal{O}_2^X, \tag{148}$$

we conclude that $\chi(\mathcal{O}_2^X) \geq 0$. Moreover, if $\chi(\mathcal{O}_2^X) = 0$, then $\chi(\mathcal{O}_1^X) = 0$ by (19). Therefore, since

$$B : \mathcal{O}_1^X \to \mathcal{O}_1^X \tag{149}$$

is a holomorphic map by Theorem 2.8, it follows from Proposition 2.2 that (149) is a covering map, and hence B is a Lattès function (notice that (148) implies that A also is a Lattès function). So, $\chi(\mathcal{O}_2^X) > 0$.

Further, by Proposition 2.1, we can complete diagram (147) to the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \widetilde{\mathcal{O}_1^X} & \xrightarrow{F} & \widetilde{\mathcal{O}_1^X} \\ \big\downarrow \theta_{\mathcal{O}_1^X} & & \big\downarrow \theta_{\mathcal{O}_1^X} \\ \mathcal{O}_1^X & \xrightarrow{B} & \mathcal{O}_1^X \\ \big\downarrow X & & \big\downarrow X \\ \mathcal{O}_2^X & \xrightarrow{A} & \mathcal{O}_2^X, \end{array} \tag{150}$$

where F is a rational function such that for any $\sigma \in \Gamma_{\mathcal{O}_1^X}$ the equality

$$F \circ \sigma = \varphi(\sigma) \circ F \tag{151}$$

holds for some automorphism $\varphi : \Gamma_{\mathcal{O}_1^X} \to \Gamma_{\mathcal{O}_1^X}$. Moreover, since Lemma 2.4 implies that $\theta_{\mathcal{O}_2^X} = X \circ \theta_{\mathcal{O}_1^X}$, it follows from Proposition 2.1 that the automorphism φ extends to an automorphism of $\Gamma_{\mathcal{O}_2^X}$ such that (151) holds for any $\sigma \in \Gamma_{\mathcal{O}_2^X}$. Observe that $F \underset{\mu}{\not\sim} z^d$. Indeed, if $F \underset{\mu}{\sim} z^d$, then $\Gamma_{\mathcal{O}_1^X}$ is cyclic and it is easy to see that F in fact is conjugated to z^d. Thus, without loss of generality we may assume that $F = z^d$ and $\theta_{\mathcal{O}_1^X} = \nu \circ z^n$ for some Möbius transformation ν, implying that B is conjugated to z^d.

Let now $X_1, X_2, \dots X_s$ be any finite set of elements of $\mathcal{E}_0(B)$. Since

$$B : \mathcal{O}_1^{X_i} \to \mathcal{O}_1^{X_i}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq s,$$

are holomorphic maps between orbifolds, it follows from Lemma 9.2 that $B : \mathcal{U} \to \mathcal{U}$, where

$$\mathcal{U} = \mathrm{LCM}\Big(\mathcal{O}_1^{X_1}, \mathcal{O}_1^{X_2}, \dots, \mathcal{O}_1^{X_2}\Big),$$

also is a holomorphic map between orbifolds. By Proposition 2.2, $\chi(\mathcal{U}) \geq 0$. Furthermore, since

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \widetilde{\mathcal{U}} & \xrightarrow{F} & \widetilde{\mathcal{U}} \\ \big\downarrow{\scriptstyle \theta_{\mathcal{U}}} & & \big\downarrow{\scriptstyle \theta_{\mathcal{U}}} \\ \mathcal{U} & \xrightarrow{B} & \mathcal{U} \end{array} \tag{152}$$

for some function F such that (151) holds for any $\sigma \in \Gamma_{\mathcal{U}}$, it follows from Proposition 9.1 that, if $\nu(\mathcal{U})$ is $\{n, n\}$ or $\{2, n, n\}$, then $n < d$. This implies that there exists an orbifold $\mathcal{O}^X$ of non-negative Euler characteristic such that for any $X \in \mathcal{E}_0(B)$ we have $\mathcal{O}_1^X \preceq \mathcal{O}^X$. Thus, we have only a finite number of possibilities for $\mathcal{O}_1^X$, and therefore in order to prove the theorem it is enough to show that for any fixed $\mathcal{O}$ there exists only a finite number of $X \in \mathcal{E}_0(B)$ such that $\mathcal{O}_1^X = \mathcal{O}$.

If $\mathcal{O}$ is non-ramified, then for any $X \in \mathcal{E}_0(B)$ such that $\mathcal{O}_1^X = \mathcal{O}$ the function F in (150) coincides with B and therefore, up to the change $X \to \mu \circ X$, the number of such X is equal to the number of subgroups of $\mathcal{G}(B)$ which is finite by Proposition 9.1 since $B \underset{\mu}{\not\sim} z^d$. Furthermore, $\deg X \leq |\mathcal{G}(B)|$ implying by Proposition 9.1 that $\deg X \leq \max\{60, 2d-1\}$. On the other hand, if $\mathcal{O}$ has a ramification, and functions $X_1, X_2, \dots X_s \in \mathcal{E}_0(B)$ satisfy

$$\mathcal{O}_1^{X_1} = \mathcal{O}_1^{X_2} = \cdots = \mathcal{O}_1^{X_s} = \mathcal{O},$$

then completing (147) for each X_i, $1 \leq i \leq s$, to (150) we see that

$$X_1 \circ \theta_{\mathcal{O}},\ X_2 \circ \theta_{\mathcal{O}},\ \dots,\ X_s \circ \theta_{\mathcal{O}} \ \in \mathcal{E}_0(F).$$

Since $F \underset{\mu}{\not\sim} z^d$ and Lemma 2.4 implies that $\mathcal{O}_1^{X_i \circ \theta_{\mathcal{O}}}$, $1 \leq i \leq s$, are non-ramified, it follows now easily from Proposition 9.1 that, up to the change $X \to \mu \circ X$, where μ is a Möbius transformation, there exists at most a finite number of $X \in \mathcal{E}_0(B)$ with $\mathcal{O}_1^X = \mathcal{O}$. Finally, clearly $\deg X \leq \max\{60, 2d-1\}$ since $\deg F = \deg B$.

□

Remark 9.4. The cardinality of $\mathcal{E}_0(B)$ can be bounded from above by a number depending on d only. Indeed, if the orbifold $\mathcal{O}^X$ appearing in the proof of Theorem 9.3 has the ramification collection $\{n, n\}$ or $\{2, n, n\}$, then $n < d$. Therefore, the number of possibilities for $\mathcal{O}_1^X$ is bounded by a number depending on d only. On the other hand, the number of subgroups of $\mathcal{G}(F)$ also can be bounded by a number depending on d only since $\deg F = \deg B$.

10 Description of $\mathcal{E}(B)$ for non-special B

In this section we describe the structure of the set $\mathcal{E}(B)$ for a non-special rational function B (Theorem 10.1) and prove Theorem 1.1 - Theorem 1.3.

Theorem 10.1. *Let B be a non-special rational function of degree $d \geq 2$. Then any $X \in \mathcal{E}(B)$ can be represented in the form*

$$X = \widetilde{X} \circ U \circ B^{\circ k}, \quad k \geq 0, \tag{153}$$

where $\chi(\mathcal{O}_2^{\widetilde{X}}) > 0$ and U is a compositional right factor of some iteration $B^{\circ l}$, $l \geq 0$. Furthermore,

$$\deg \widetilde{X} \leq \max\{60, 2d-1\} \tag{154}$$

and

$$l \leq (2\theta(d) + 26)\left(\frac{d}{2} - 1\right), \tag{155}$$

where θ is defined by (130).

Proof. If $\mathbb{C}(X, B) = \mathbb{C}(x)$, then the statements of the theorem hold for $l = 0$ and $k = 0$ by Theorem 9.1. So, assume that $\mathbb{C}(X, B) \neq \mathbb{C}(x)$. Without loss of generality we may assume that X is not a rational function in $B^{\circ k}$, $k \geq 1$, since if $X = \widehat{X} \circ B^{\circ k}$ is contained in $\mathcal{E}(B)$, then $\widehat{X}$ also is contained in $\mathcal{E}(B)$.

Let U_1 be any rational function such that

$$\mathbb{C}(X, B) = \mathbb{C}(U_1) \tag{156}$$

so that

$$X = X_1 \circ U_1, \quad B = V_1 \circ U_1 \tag{157}$$

for some $X_1, V_1 \in \mathbb{C}(z)$ such that $\mathbb{C}(X_1, V_1) = \mathbb{C}(z)$. Clearly, (3) and (157) imply that

$$A \circ X_1 = X_1 \circ (U_1 \circ V_1).$$

Thus, $A, X_1, U_1 \circ V_1$ is another solution of (3). If $\mathbb{C}(X_1, U_1 \circ V_1) = \mathbb{C}(z)$, then, by Theorem 9.1, $\chi(\mathcal{O}_2^{X_1}) > 0$ and $\deg X_1 \leq \max\{60, 2d-1\}$. Furthermore, U_1 is a compositional right factor of B. In general case, define X_{i+1}, V_{i+1}, and U_{i+1}, $i \geq 1$, as rational functions satisfying the equalities

$$\mathbb{C}(X_i, U_i \circ V_i) = \mathbb{C}(U_{i+1}), \quad \deg U_{i+1} > 1, \tag{158}$$

and

$$X_i = X_{i+1} \circ U_{i+1}, \tag{159}$$

$$U_i \circ V_i = V_{i+1} \circ U_{i+1}. \tag{160}$$

Clearly,

$$A \circ X_i = X_i \circ (U_i \circ V_i).$$

Furthermore, $\deg X_{i+1} < \deg X_i$, implying that $\mathbb{C}(X_l, U_l \circ V_l) = \mathbb{C}(z)$ for some $l \geq 1$. Thus, we have

$$X = X_l \circ U_l \circ U_{l-1} \circ \cdots \circ U_1,$$

where $\chi(\mathcal{O}_2^{X_l}) > 0$ and $\deg X_l \leq \max\{60, 2d-1\}$. Furthermore, since

$$B^{\circ l} = (V_1 \circ U_1)^{\circ l} = V_1 \circ (U_1 \circ V_1)^{\circ l-1} \circ U_1 = V_1 \circ (V_2 \circ U_2)^{\circ l-1} \circ U_1 =$$

$$= V_1 \circ V_2 \circ (U_2 \circ V_2)^{\circ l-1} \circ U_2 \circ U_1 = V_1 \circ V_2 \circ \cdots \circ V_l \circ U_l \circ \cdots \circ U_2 \circ U_1,$$

the rational function

$$U = U_l \circ \cdots \circ U_2 \circ U_1$$

is a compositional right factor of $B^{\circ l}$. Therefore, in order to prove the theorem we only must show that l satisfies inequality (155).

By construction,

$$\mathbb{C}(X_i, V_i) = \mathbb{C}(z), \quad i \geq 1, \tag{161}$$

implying that

$$\mathbb{C}(V_i, U_{i+1}) = \mathbb{C}(z), \quad i \geq 1, \tag{162}$$

since any compositional right factor of U_{i+1} is a compositional right factor of X_i in view of (159). It its turn, (162) yields that

$$\deg U_{i+1} \leq \deg U_i, \quad i \geq 1. \tag{163}$$

Indeed, setting

$$F_i = U_i \circ V_i = V_{i+1} \circ U_{i+1}, \tag{164}$$

we see that each block of the imprimitivity system I of F_i corresponding to the decomposition $F = V_{i+1} \circ U_{i+1}$ contains $\deg U_{i+1}$ elements, while the number of blocks of the imprimitivity system J of F corresponding to the decomposition $F = U_i \circ V_i$ is equal to $\deg U_i$. Therefore, if $\deg U_{i+1} > \deg U_i$, then there is a block of J containing at least two elements from a block of I, implying that $\mathbb{C}(V_i, U_{i+1}) \neq \mathbb{C}(z)$. Alternatively, inequality (163) follows from the construction of the fiber product.

The condition that X is not a rational function in B implies that $\deg U_1 < d$. Since by construction $\deg U_l \geq 2$, this implies by (163) that the sequence of equalities (160) is a chain. We will denote this chain by $\mathcal{C}$. Let

$$1 = k_1 \leq k_2 \leq \cdots \leq k_r = l$$

be indices such that

$$\deg U_1 = \deg U_2 = \cdots = \deg U_{k_2-1},$$

$$\deg U_{k_2} = \deg U_{k_2+1} = \cdots = \deg U_{k_3-1},$$

$$\cdots$$

$$\deg U_{k_{r-1}} = \deg U_{k_{r-1}+1} = \cdots = \deg U_l,$$

and

$$\deg U_{k_{r-1}} < \cdots < \deg U_{k_2} < \deg U_1. \tag{165}$$

By Lemma 2.6, any subchain $\mathcal{E}_{k_j,k_{j+1}}$, $1 \leq j \leq r-1$, of $\mathcal{E}$ is good. Therefore, by Theorem 8.6, unless the basis of $\mathcal{E}_{k_j,k_{j+1}}$ is special, its length is less than or equal to $2\theta(n) + 26$. Since the basis of $\mathcal{E}_{k_j,k_{j+1}}$ is special if and only if B is special (see the end of the proof of Theorem 8.6), this implies that

$$l \leq (r-1)(2\theta(n) + 26).$$

Since $\deg U_1$ is a proper divisor of d, if $d = 2$ (in fact, if d is any prime), then the theorem is true for $l = 0$. On the other hand, if $d \geq 2$, then it follows from (165) and the inequalities

$$2 \leq \deg U_l, \quad \deg U_1 \leq d/2$$

that $r - 1 \leq d/2 - 1$. □

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Let $X \in \mathcal{E}(B)$. Assuming that X is not a polynomial in $B^{\circ k}$, $k \geq 1$, in the notation of the proof of Theorem 10.1 we have:

$$X = \widetilde{X} \circ U \tag{166}$$

and

$$A \circ \widetilde{X} = \widetilde{X} \circ F_l. \tag{167}$$

Furthermore,

$$F_l \circ U = U \circ B, \tag{168}$$

since

$$U_l \circ V_l \circ U_l \circ U_{l-1} \circ \cdots \circ U_2 \circ U_1 = U_l \circ U_{l-1} \circ V_{l-1} \circ U_{l-1} \circ \cdots \circ U_2 \circ U_1 =$$

$$= U_l \circ U_{l-1} \circ U_{l-2} \circ V_{l-2} \circ \cdots \circ U_2 \circ U_1 = \cdots = U \circ V_1 \circ U_1.$$

Since non-equivalent decompositions of a rational function R of degree n correspond to imprimitivity systems of the permutation group $G_R \subset S_n$, there exists a function ω on $\mathbb{N}$ such that any rational function of degree n has at most $\omega(n)$ non-equivalent decompositions into a composition of rational functions. Thus, there exist $U_1, U_2, \ldots, U_{l_1}$, where $l_1 \leq \omega(d^l)$, such that for U in (166) the equality $U = \nu \circ U_j$ holds for some j, $1 \leq j \leq l_1$, and a Möbius transformation ν. Correspondingly, there exist $G_1, G_2, \ldots, G_{l_1}$, where $l_1 \leq \omega(d^l)$, such that for F_l in (167), (168) the equality

$$F_l = \nu \circ G_j \circ \nu^{-1}$$

holds for some j, $1 \leq j \leq l_1$, and a Möbius transformation ν. Moreover, changing $\widetilde{X}$ to $\widetilde{X} \circ \nu$, and U to $\nu^{-1} \circ U$, without loss of generality we may assume that $U = U_j$ and $F_l = G_j$. Finally, by Proposition 9.1, for each $F_l = G_j$ up to the change $\widetilde{X} \to \mu \circ \widetilde{X}$, where μ is a Möbius transformation, there exists only a finite number of $\widetilde{X}$ satisfying (167), and if to $\widetilde{X}$ corresponds a function A, then to the function $\mu \circ X$ corresponds the function $\mu \circ A \circ \mu^{-1}$. Taking into account that all the bounds appeared in the proof can be made effective, this proves the theorem. □

Proof of Theorem 1.2. Assume that X commutes with B. Without loss of generality we may assume that X is not a polynomial in $B^{\circ k}$, $k \geq 1$, since if $X = \widehat{X} \circ B^{\circ k}$ commutes with B, then $\widehat{X}$ also commutes with B. By Theorem 1.1, there exist rational functions $X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_l$ such that

$$X = \mu \circ X_j$$

for some j, $1 \le j \le l$, and a Möbius transformation μ. Furthermore, if $\widetilde{X}$ is another rational function commuting with B such that

$$\widetilde{X} = \widetilde{\mu} \circ X_j$$

for the same j but a different Möbius transformation $\widetilde{\mu}$, then

$$\widetilde{X} = \nu \circ X,$$

where $\nu = \widetilde{\mu} \circ \mu^{-1}$, and the equalities

$$B \circ \nu \circ X = \nu \circ X \circ B, \quad B \circ X = X \circ B$$

imply the equality

$$B \circ \nu \circ X = \nu \circ B \circ X,$$

which implies in its turn that B and ν commute. Since the number of Möbius transformation commuting with B is finite by Proposition 9.1, this proves the theorem. □

Proof of Theorem 1.3. First, it follows from Theorem 1.2 that there exists a computable function δ such that whenever the function B is non-special the equality $A^{\circ l} = B^{\circ k}$ holds for some $l \le \delta(d)$ and $k \ge 1$ (see the introduction), implying that $k \le \delta(d) \log_d e$ and

$$l + k \le \delta(d) + \delta(d) \log_d e.$$

Similarly, if X is non-special, then

$$l + k \le \delta(e) + \delta(e) \log_e d.$$

Therefore, if at least one of the functions B and X is non-special, then

$$l + k \le \delta(d) + \delta(d) \log_d e + \delta(e) + \delta(e) \log_e d.$$

So, assume that both B and X are special. If both X and B are Lattès functions, then we are done. Therefore, it is enough to show that if $B = z^{\pm d}$, then X is conjugated to $z^{\pm e}$, while if $B = \pm T_d$, then X is conjugated to $\pm T_e$.

If $B = z^{\pm d}$, then, applying to the equality

$$B \circ X = X \circ B \tag{169}$$

the iterative process from the proof of Theorem 1.1 and taking into account that any decomposition of z^n has form (28), we can find (in fact, after the very first iteration) a rational function $\widetilde{X}$ such that

$$X = \widetilde{X} \circ z^s, \quad \mathbb{C}(\widetilde{X}, B) = \mathbb{C}(z),$$

and

$$B \circ \widetilde{X} = \widetilde{X} \circ B, \tag{170}$$

If $\deg \widetilde{X} = 1$, then (170) implies that $\widetilde{X} = az^{\pm 1}$, $a \in \mathbb{C}$, and hence X is conjugated to $z^{\pm s}$. Otherwise, applying Theorem 2.8 to (170), we conclude that $z^{\pm d} : \mathcal{O}_2^X \to \mathcal{O}_2^X$ is a minimal holomorphic map between orbifolds. By Proposition 4.3, this implies that $\nu(\mathcal{O}_2^X) = \{l, l\}$, $l \geq 2$, and hence

$$\widetilde{X} = \theta_{\mathcal{O}_2^X} = z^{\pm l} \circ \mu$$

for some Möbius transformation μ. Clearly, $F = \mu \circ z^d \circ \mu^{-1}$ makes the diagram commutative

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \widetilde{\mathcal{O}_2^X} & \xrightarrow{F} & \widetilde{\mathcal{O}_2^X} \\ \big\downarrow{\scriptstyle \theta_{\mathcal{O}_2^X}} & & \big\downarrow{\scriptstyle \theta_{\mathcal{O}_2^X}} \\ \mathcal{O}_2^X & \xrightarrow{B} & \mathcal{O}_2^X . \end{array}$$

Since $F = B = z^{\pm d}$ also does, it follows from Proposition 2.1 that

$$z^d = \sigma \circ \mu \circ z^d \circ \mu^{-1}$$

for some $\sigma \in \Gamma_{\mathcal{O}_2^X}$ implying that $\mu \in \mathcal{G}(B)$. Since this yields that $\mu = az^{\pm 1}$, $a \in \mathbb{C}$, we conclude that X is conjugated to $z^{\pm ls}$.

If $B = \pm T_d$, the proof is similar. Namely, we can find a rational function $\widetilde{X}$ such that

$$X = \widetilde{X} \circ T_s, \quad \mathbb{C}(\widetilde{X}, \pm T_d) = \mathbb{C}(z),$$

and

$$\pm T_d \circ \widetilde{X} = \widetilde{X} \circ \pm T_d. \tag{171}$$

Using Proposition 9.1 and the formula

$$T_n = \frac{n}{2} \sum_{k=0}^{[n/2]} (-1)^k \frac{(n-k-1)!}{k!(n-2k)!} (2x)^{n-2k},$$

it is easy that $\mathcal{G}(B)$ is a cyclic group consisting from the transformations $\pm z$. Therefore, if $\deg \widetilde{X} = 1$, then $X = \pm T_s$ since $\widetilde{X} \in \mathcal{E}(B)$ by (171). On the hand, if $\deg \widetilde{X} > 1$, then applying Proposition 4.3, we see that $\nu(\mathcal{O}_2^X) = \{2, 2, l\}$, $l \geq 2$. Therefore, either $X = \pm \frac{1}{2}\big(z^l + \frac{1}{z^l}\big) \circ \mu$ or $X = \pm T_l \circ \mu$ for some Möbius transformation μ. Furthermore, the first case is impossible, since otherwise $\mathcal{G}(B)$ would contain a dihedral group. On the other hand, by Theorem 2.8, in the second case $\pm T_n : \mathcal{O}_1^X \to \mathcal{O}_1^X$ is a minimal holomorphic map between orbifolds, implying that $\mu = \pm z$, and X is conjugated to $\pm T_{ls}$. □

References

[1] C. W. Curtis, I. Reiner, *Representation theory of finite groups and associative algebras,* Pure and Appl. Math., vol. 11, Interscience, New York, 1962.

[2] A. Eremenko, *Some functional equations connected with the iteration of rational functions* (Russian), Algebra i Analiz 1 (1989), 102-116; translation in Leningrad Math. J. 1 (1990), 905-919.

[3] A. Eremenko, *Invariant curves and semiconjugacies of rational functions,* Fundamenta Math., 219, 3 (2012) 263-270.

[4] P. Fatou, *Sur l'iteration analytique et les substitutions permutables,* J. Math. Pures Appl. (9), 2, 1923, 343-384.

[5] G. Julia, *Mémoire sur la permutabilité des fractions rationelles*, Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. 39 (3) (1922), 131-215.

[6] F. Klein, *Lectures on the icosahedron and the solution of equations of the fifth degree*, New York: Dover Publications, (1956).

[7] A. Medvedev, T. Scanlon, *Invariant varieties for polynomial dynamical systems,* Annals of Mathematics, 179 (2014), no. 1, 81 - 177.

[8] J. Milnor, *On Lattès maps,* Dynamics on the Riemann Sphere. Eds. P. Hjorth and C. L. Petersen. A Bodil Branner Festschrift, European Mathematical Society, 2006, pp. 9-43.

[9] J. Milnor, *Dynamics in one complex variable*, Princeton Annals in Mathematics 160. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press (2006).

[10] M. Muzychuk, F. Pakovich, *Jordan-Holder theorem for imprimitivity systems and maximal decompositions of rational functions*, Proc. Lond. Math. Soc., 102 (2011) , no. 1, 1-24.

[11] F. Pakovich, *On polynomials sharing preimages of compact sets, and related questions*, Geom. Funct. Anal, 18, No. 1, 163-183 (2008).

[12] F. Pakovich, *Prime and composite Laurent polynomials,* Bull. Sci. Math., 133 (2009), 693-732

[13] F. Pakovich, *On semiconjugate rational functions,* preprint, arXiv:1108:1900.

[14] F. Pakovich, *On the genus of an algebraic curve A(x)-B(y)=0*, preprint, arxiv:1505.01007.

[15] F. Pakovich, *Polynomial semiconjugacies, decompositions of iterations, and invariant curves*, preprint. arxiv:1505.0635.

[16] J. F. Ritt. *On the iteration of rational functions,* Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 21 (1920), no. 3, 348-356.

[17] J Ritt, *Prime and composite polynomials*, American M. S. Trans. 23, 51-66 (1922).

[18] J. F. Ritt. *Permutable rational functions,* Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 25 (1923), 399-448.